UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
3 1822 02362 1014

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

IN IDEA AND IN HISTORY

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

IN IDEA AND IN HISTORY

EIGHT LECTURES

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
IN THE YEAR 1909 ON THE FOUNDATION OF
THE LATE REV. JOHN BAMPTON, M.A.
CANON OF SALISBURY

BY

WALTER HOBHOUSE, M.A.

HONORARY CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF BIRMINGHAM CATHEDRAL
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM
FORMERLY FELLOW OF HERTFORD COLLEGE
AND STUDENT AND TUTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1916

Dominus noster Christus veritatem se non consuetudinem cognominavit.—TERTULLIAN, *De virginibus velandis*, i.

O navicella mia, com' mal se' carca!

DANTE, *Purgatorio*, xxxii. 129.

First Edition 1910
Second Edition, revised, 1911; *re-issue* 1916

CAROLO

BIRMINGHAMIENSI EPISCOPO

AMICO AMICVS

MAGISTRO DISCIPVLVS

PATRI IN DEO FILIVS

EXTRACT

FROM THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

OF THE LATE

Rev. JOHN BAMPTON

CANON OF SALISBURY

"I GIVE and bequeath my Lands and Estates to the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford for ever, to have and to hold all and singular the said Lands or Estates upon trust, and to the intents and purposes hereinafter mentioned; that is to say, I will and appoint that the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford for the time being shall take and receive all the rents, issues, and profits thereof, and (after all taxes, reparations, and necessary deductions made) that he pay all the remainder to the endowment of eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, to be established for ever in the said University, and to be performed in the manner following:

"I direct and appoint, that, upon the first Tuesday in Easter Term, a Lecturer be yearly chosen by the Heads of Colleges only, and by no others, in the room adjoining to the Printing-House, between the hours of ten in the morning and two in the afternoon, to preach eight Divinity

Lecture Sermons, the year following, at St. Mary's in Oxford, between the commencement of the last month in Lent Term, and the end of the third week in Act Term.

"Also I direct and appoint, that the eight Divinity Lecture Sermons shall be preached upon either of the following Subjects—to confirm and establish the Christian Faith, and to confute all heretics and schismatics—upon the divine authority of the holy Scriptures — upon the authority of the writings of the primitive Fathers, as to the faith and practice of the primitive Church—upon the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—upon the Divinity of the Holy Ghost—upon the Articles of the Christian Faith, as comprehended in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.

"Also I direct, that thirty copies of the eight Divinity Lecture Sermons shall be always printed, within two months after they are preached; and one copy shall be given to the Chancellor of the University, and one copy to the Head of every College, and one copy to the Mayor of the city of Oxford, and one copy to be put into the Bodleian Library; and the expenses of printing them shall be paid out of the revenue of the Land or Estates given for establishing the Divinity Lecture Sermons; and the preacher shall not be paid, nor be entitled to the revenue, before they are printed.

"Also I direct and appoint, that no person shall be qualified to preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons, unless he hath taken the degree of Master of Arts at least, in one of the two Universities of Oxford or Cambridge; and that the same person shall never preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons twice."

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

A SECOND EDITION of these lectures having been called for, I have taken the opportunity of revising them carefully. In two or three instances misprints have been corrected; in some passages the punctuation has been improved, and in others the form of expression has been modified. The alterations are, however, almost entirely of a verbal character, and the pagination of the book remains the same. The only cases where any alteration has been found necessary in statements of historical fact are those on p. 189 (Canossa) and on p. 206 (The Pragmatic Sanction).

When these lectures were delivered I ventured to predict (p. 7) that such controversy as they might arouse would not follow the ordinary lines of religious cleavage, and that much of what I had to say might be accepted by Presbyterians or "Free Churchmen," while much would be distasteful to many members of the Church of England. This prediction has been amply verified. The most severe attack upon the book has come from the *Church Quarterly Review*, while it has been treated with a large

measure of sympathy in periodicals representing Scottish Presbyterianism or English Nonconformity, as well as by Dr. Kattenbusch in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* and Dom Morin in the *Revue Bénédictine*. Further, it is true that within the borders of the Church of England the reception accorded to the book has not been determined by the ordinary party lines. No critics have shown more sympathy with my main contentions than the writers who reviewed it in the *English Church Review* and the *Reunion Magazine*; while on the other hand some representative Evangelicals have welcomed the book (or at least many of its arguments), rightly discerning that there is much in common between the Evangelical view of the relations of the Church and the World and the view which I have maintained, although Evangelicals have been prone to emphasise individualism, whereas I have laid more stress upon the corporate aspect of religion. On the other hand the argument of the book has failed to commend itself to many Churchmen who hold a more central position, and it is naturally distasteful to all whose sympathies lie in the direction of Erastianism. Nor can I fail to notice that, although the doctrine of religious liberty and of the relations of Church and State which I have presented is (I believe) pure Liberal doctrine—and indeed the only doctrine ultimately consistent with Liberalism—the reviews in organs representing political Liberalism have for the most part been hostile to my contentions.

It would be impossible within the limits of a preface to enter into a discussion of all the criticisms, or even of the most important criticisms, which have reached me. I am glad to find that, in spite of the wide range of history which is covered by the lectures, very few of my statements of fact have been called in question, and that in only two cases has any modification been found necessary. The criticisms relate, for the most part, to matters of opinion, and to the principles on which historical phenomena are to be interpreted. I did not expect to command any general consent to the opinions which I advanced, and I have not in any way shrunk from candid criticism. Nor have I any reason to complain of the way in which adverse criticism has been expressed; indeed it has in almost all cases been accompanied by generous expressions of sympathy and appreciation.

The only criticism which is wholly unrelieved in its tone of condemnation is that which is contained in a lengthy article by Dr. E. W. Watson in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1910. There are many to whom a Regius Professor's lightest word is heavy, and as Dr. Watson's article is the fullest and most severe attack on the position maintained in my lectures, and also probably represents a considerable body of opinion, it may be well that I should say a few words as to the attitude adopted in it. Dr. Watson expresses himself with somewhat unusual acrimony and contempt; but that is a question of taste. He has thought well to give an

imaginary account of the "mental process" by which my "grip of facts" has been loosened, and my judgment has become hopelessly abstract. He makes it an accusation against me that I have taken a motto from Dante, "who was, to say the least, a very detached observer of the religious phenomena of his day," and he appears to regard detachment as a positive disqualification for writing history. He declines to regard me as "a serious historian," or my line of argument as either historical or philosophical, because I have treated Church and State as "two independent and co-existent entities, working *in pari materia*." I must confess that I had always regarded "detachment" (if by "detachment" is meant freedom from partiality and prepossessions) as one of the first qualifications for writing history, and I can only rejoice if in any measure I have attained it. But if by "detachment" Dr. Watson means the "remoteness from facts" and the abstract point of view with which he elsewhere charges me, I can honestly plead "Not guilty." My lectures were throughout an appeal to facts—to the facts both of the present and of the past. They originated in an attempt to explain the urgent facts of our present distresses by the historical facts of the New Testament and of Church History. It may be that I have not always interpreted the facts correctly, but I do not think that "remoteness from facts" can justly be laid to my charge. The conditions of my life are such that remoteness from facts would not have been an easy thing to achieve, and my experi-

ence leads me to believe that it is more likely to be attained in Oxford than in Birmingham. Certainly it is significant that I have been assured by many active and experienced parochial clergy that what I have written seems to them to go to the root of the practical difficulties which confront them in their every-day work. It is true, of course, that I have in some degree personified "Church" and "State," and treated them as separate entities, and passed judgment on their action or policy at different periods, in spite of the perfectly obvious fact that at any moment the individuals who compose the Church must be to a large extent identical with those who compose the State. I do not believe, however, that there is anything more "abstract" about my treatment of these entities than can be found in the treatment of "serious historians." Every historian, serious or otherwise, who wishes to avoid chaos, must treat Church and State as entities, and personify them, and pass moral judgments upon them. If Dr. Watson objects to my treatment as "abstract," he must, I think, object equally to many passages in Mr. Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* (*e.g.* the passage quoted on p. 212 of my lectures) and in Dean Church's *Beginning of the Middle Ages* (*e.g.* ch. iii.). I am really puzzled to know how Church History is to be written in the future if the Church is no longer to be treated as "a separate entity," and if all judgments on her corporate action are tabooed, either on the ground that they belong to ethics and not to history, or

because the Church (like a modern Trade Union) is to be regarded as having no collective responsibility for the actions of her leaders. But I fancy that Dr. Watson's deepest objection to my line of argument is due to our divergence as to the fatalistic interpretation of history. I have collected a large number of facts as to the policy of the Church, the processes of wholesale conversion, coercion, secularisation, etc., and their effects upon the life of the Church. I do not understand that Dr. Watson questions these facts. But he explains them by a theory of design and development, "a divine purpose for the education of the world." "The price had to be paid," "a phase through which the Divine Society had to pass"—such euphemistic phrases are as frequent in Dr. Watson's pages as "Erastianism" is in mine. Indeed Dr. Watson appears to arraign me as a disbeliever in Providence, because I hold that the Church took a wrong turn in the fourth century, and that both then and later it "did not perform the impossible task of being independent of its environment." His argument seems to me to involve a difficulty far greater than that of belief in the fallibility of the Church. He and those who think with him are in reality maintaining that the Church could only have discharged her mission by becoming secularised; that is to say, could only have survived and spread by disobeying her Master's fundamental teaching as to discipleship. I contend that such a position is really far more fatal to any true belief in Divine Providence than the

argument which I have put forward. Dr. Watson writes as if the Church had merely failed to *evolve* a high standard of action, a standard which would have been too advanced for its environment; but the point surely is that in the fourth century the Church (if I may relapse into personification) actually turned her back on our Lord's teaching and on the principles which in the main she had been following for three centuries. To maintain that such a policy was inevitable does appear to me "fatalistic." Indeed Dr. Watson's whole argument is an excellent example of the fatalism in historical interpretation and the complacency in religious outlook against which I ventured to protest in my lectures. At the risk of being called "revolutionary" I cannot subscribe to the comfortable doctrine that in Church History whatever has been must have been, and that whatever is is right—in short, that "tous les événements sont enchainés dans le meilleur des mondes possible." Nor can it justly be maintained that a belief in the Divine origin of the Church involves the negation of the possibility of a great error in policy. If the New Testament writings are worthy of credence, Christ laid down certain great principles; if Church History is worthy of credence, the Church of the fourth century abandoned them. The discrepancy cannot be denied. Dr. Watson argues that (in spite of the discrepancy) the Church could not have acted otherwise, and that an "unconditioned" Christianity is a delusion of abstract thinkers. To me it seems that whatever the

motives were, the violation of principles is evident, and that the effect was *propter vitam vivendi perdere causas*, as indeed was abundantly proved by the lowering of the spiritual level in the succeeding centuries. I have disclaimed any attempt to assess the responsibility of individuals for this or later errors, nor have I written with any object of imputing blame. All that has been attempted is to discover whether the policy adopted was right or wrong; and the conclusion that it was wrong can only be escaped either by the adoption of the fatalistic principle, or by arguing that the teaching of the New Testament is not to be taken seriously, or by the plea that the Church is not an entity of which right and wrong can be predicated. To those who are content to adopt any of these three courses the argument of these lectures will undoubtedly fail to make an effective appeal.

Only two things remain to be said. It was perhaps natural that many of my reviewers should have been more interested in the last two lectures than in the earlier ones, and that some should not have resisted the temptation to label my book as "A plea for Disestablishment." I thought I had made it plain that I did not regard Disestablishment as as end in itself, or as a panacea, but only as a necessary step towards regaining freedom of action for the Church, and especially freedom to pursue a more intensive policy.

At least one critic has reproached me for not propounding in detail some scheme for the restora-

LECTURE I

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

μὴ θαυμάζετε, ἀδελφοί, εἰ μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος. ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν, ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς.—1 St. John iii. 13.

I

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

St. Luke ix. 23, 24: "And he said unto all, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it."

St. John xv 18, 19: "If the world hateth you, ye know that it hath hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own: but because ye are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."

"*The World by professing Christianity is so far from being a less dangerous enemy than it was before, that it has by its favours destroyed more Christians than ever it did by the most violent persecution.*" These words were written just 180 years ago by William Law, the most spiritual of all the English writers of the eighteenth century.[1] Law was, indeed, a mystic; and Common Sense ever loves to laugh mystics out of the court of Reason without a hearing. But Law was also a man of keen observation and penetrating logic; and while I do not

[1] William Law, *Serious Call*, chapter xvii. (*Collected Works* 1893, vol. iv. p. 178).

ask you to accept his dictum without qualification or without proof, I think that it may well serve us as a starting-point for our inquiry into the relations—ideal, historical, actual—between the Church and the World. Thinking men who care for religion have become profoundly conscious that, although the Christian ideal of life has never been superseded or even rivalled, there has been, and is, a wide-spread failure to make this ideal the actual standard of Christendom—in other words, that a large proportion of our Christianity is little more than nominal. Some general causes of this failure were discussed with insight and eloquence two years ago by my immediate predecessor in these lectures.[1] I do not want to traverse the same ground. I should wish to associate myself generally with his diagnosis, and to acknowledge the failure which he analysed; and then to ask how far this failure may be traced to any defects of method and policy on the part of the Church in her relations to the World.[2]

[1] J. H. F. Peile, *The Reproach of the Gospel*: The Bampton Lectures for 1907.

[2] I am aware that in using "she" and "her" in reference to the Church I come under the condemnation of Bishop Creighton (*Life and Letters*, ii. 506) and other high authorities. But if I err, I err deliberately and in good company. In many cases it is almost necessary to personify the Church, and English idiom does not admit of personification except by the use of the feminine. Nothing is further from my intention than by this use to endorse Bluntschli's doctrine that the Church is feminine and the State masculine (*The Theory of the Modern State*, English translation, 2nd ed., p. 23).

The inquiry is indisputably one of great importance and of great difficulty, and to conduct it adequately would need the attainments of an Acton or a Döllinger. No one can be more conscious than myself how inadequate is my equipment for the task; my defence must be that it seemed better that the attempt should be made inadequately than not made at all, and that perchance its very inadequacy might induce some more competent writer to grapple more worthily with a subject of permanent and vital interest.

The subject, although a vast one, has its limits, and we must observe them scrupulously. We are not primarily concerned with the general history of the Church, or with its internal constitution and its ministry, except so far as they throw light upon the relations between the Church and the World.

It is hardly necessary to stop at this moment to define the two terms, for the nature of the two conceptions will emerge in the examination of the evidence of the New Testament. It may suffice to say in this place that under "the relations between the Church and the World" must be included the Church's relations to the mass of individuals composing any community, nation, or empire, and also to the organised government or civil power in every community. We shall therefore have to consider such phenomena as persecution and State hostility on the one hand, and State recognition and protection on the other, as well as the aim and policy of the Church at different periods with regard to the question

whether she should try to make herself co-extensive with the World, or should proclaim her distinctness from the World—whether, in fact, her policy should be primarily *extensive* or primarily *intensive*.

The method which is contemplated is historical throughout. The title "The Church and the World in *Idea* and in History" does not imply any metaphysical or *a priori* speculation. By the "idea" of the Church we mean simply the intention of Christ for the Church in relation to the World, the principles on which He intended her to act; and this idea can only be known to us by the investigation through purely historical methods of the evidence with regard to Christ's intention. By the words "in history" it is meant to include the question how far the Church during the nineteen centuries of her existence has been faithful to Christ's intention, and how she has fared in observing it or in diverging from it. In the course of the argument it will be necessary to examine much historical evidence and to pass many historical judgments. In a large number of cases these judgments must be, at the best, only probable, owing either to defective evidence or to the nature of the questions themselves. But the endeavour will be made to follow the historical evidence whithersoever it may lead us; and it may be said at once that if the argument is not historically sound it will be wholly valueless. Lastly, let it be said that the lectures have been written without any wish to enter into controversy upon many matters about which

Christians are most sharply divided into different camps. Much of what will be said might be accepted by many Presbyterians or Free Churchmen: much, I fear, will be distasteful to many members of the Church of England. On some controversial points it has been necessary to make my own position clear, for listeners and readers have a right to know the principles from which a lecturer starts; but I have restricted these occasions as far as possible, and such controversy as is raised will not follow the ordinary lines of cleavage. My *aim*, at all events, has been not controversy but truth.

In the first lecture we shall be concerned with the Church and the World in the New Testament. It is inevitable, therefore, that something should be said with regard to the authenticity and authority of the New Testament writings. It must be said briefly, and without detailed argument or evidence, for the simple purpose of making clear the position from which the argument starts.

In the first place, there is in these lectures a full admission of the claim of criticism to examine on historical principles, without fear or favour, such questions as the date, integrity, and authorship of each book of the New Testament, and an unreserved acknowledgment of the duty of accepting whatever results are firmly established by the most scientific criticism.

Secondly, there is a strong conviction that the attempts of "advanced" critics to assign a late date to most of the books of the New Testament have

not proved successful. Criticism has, indeed, profoundly affected our views as to the nature of inspiration and as to the process by which the Four Gospels assumed their present shape; but it has, so far (I hold), wholly failed in its attempt to prove the Four Gospels to be second-century documents, or the Pauline Epistles to be mainly spurious, or the Acts of the Apostles a late and unhistorical treatise. The Synoptic Gospels can be legitimately regarded as first-century documents. Of them the Second is undoubtedly the earliest, and the Third may almost certainly be attributed to St. Luke; and the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is at least as probable as any other hypothesis. With regard to the Acts of the Apostles, such eminent writers as Harnack and Ramsay have now accepted the Lucan authorship. The genuineness of four of the most important Epistles of St. Paul stands unquestioned by all sober criticism; there is strong evidence of the early date of the Epistles of St. James, St. John, and 1 St. Peter; nor will many critics in England be found to assert that the Apocalypse is later than the reign of Domitian. It is not necessary for the purpose of these lectures to discuss the date or authorship of 2 St. Peter or St. Jude, as to which there is greater doubt, or even that of the Pastoral Epistles. With regard to the latter, and to such Epistles as those to the Ephesians and Colossians, I would only say that those who assail them seem to me to do so arbitrarily, almost entirely on the ground that they contain views which are

assumed, but can in no way be proved, to have been late in their development. Substantially, the result is that at least the great mass of the New Testament writings must be regarded as belonging to the first century, and as being the work of those whose names they bear.[1]

But here a further question arises. Assuming that the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles are, in the main, early and genuine documents, can we be sure that they give a true and accurate account of our Lord's teaching and of His life on earth, and of the early history of the Church? It is round this question, and not round the exact date of documents, that the battles of criticism will rage in the immediate future. It is possible, for instance, to assign an early date to the first Gospel, and yet to maintain that the author misconceived our Lord's teaching about the *Parousia*; or to accept the Epistle to the Romans as Pauline, and yet to argue that St. Paul was absolutely mistaken in his teaching about sin.[2]

[1] For dates of New Testament writings, see Appendix, Note A, p. 345.

[2] *Report of the* (*Manchester*) *Church Congress*, 1908, p. 48. Dr. Burkitt is reported as saying, "We may accept St. Paul's Epistles as genuine, as being really letters of Paul of Tarsus, the great Apostle who brought the Gospel into Europe. But even if they be genuine, can we accept to-day the views they champion about the origin of evil and the primitive fall of man? Can we accept, as it stands, St. Paul's doctrine of sin and death, a belief so closely bound up with a belief in the story of Eden and the forbidden fruit? You know we can do nothing of the kind. . . . There is no use in shirking the plain fact: we do not now receive St. Paul as an authority upon the origin of sin and of death."

Again, critics who accept a book as a whole may, and do, endeavour to eliminate individual passages which do not square with their view of what the writer "must" or "ought to" have said; as when a destructive critic gets rid of the passages where the word ἐκκλησία occurs in St. Matthew,[1] or when Dr. Harnack eliminates our Lord's references to His Universal Mission,[2] by condemning them as introducing later ideas. Such a method, however fashionable, is in reality arbitrary, *a priori*, and unscientific, and its results differ widely in their value from the results obtained by careful textual criticism and the patient interrogation of the documents themselves by an inductive method. Every such attempt must be treated on its own merits. As regards the authority of our Lord Himself, these lectures appeal primarily to those who believe in His Incarnation, and therefore in His Divine authority. However much we may believe in the reality of the *Kenosis*, we must at least suppose Him competent to legislate for the Divine Society which He was founding; and even for those who reject His Divinity it may be worth while to inquire what was His intention with regard to His Church, and how far it has been fulfilled.

Before we enter upon the examination of that intention, we must go back a little to see what was the condition of the World into which the Church

[1] Schmiedel, in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, s.v. "Gospels," § 136.

[2] See Appendix, Note B, p. 348.

was launched, and what was the nature of the relations between existing religions and existing communities of men and civil governments. How far had the idea of a Church been anticipated in pre-Christian thought and practice?

What we may call the "background" of the New Testament is plainly twofold. It is in part Judaic, in part Pagan. The converts of the first few years of Christianity were mainly Jews; after that, they were mainly drawn from those who had practised some form of Gentile religion current under the Roman Empire.

In Judaism there certainly existed the conception of a Church. Judaism was a Theocracy, and the theocratic character of the Jewish State by no means disappeared with the establishment of a monarchy. Every Jew believed himself to be a child of Abraham and a partaker of the promises made to Abraham. The Church and the nation were co-extensive, and there was no separation between divine law and civil law. But beyond this theocratic identification of Church and State there had arisen in the prophetic writings the idea of a kingdom of God which transcended the bounds of Jewish nationality. We must not stop to trace the development of this idea, but we note it as evidence that preparation had, so far, been made for the idea of the Christian Church.[1] In the pagan world the conditions were

[1] Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, pp. 21-27. For the identification of divine law and civil law in Judaism, cp. Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, § 28 (div. ii. vol. ii. p. 93).

widely different. Not only was there no universal system of belief and worship for the whole Roman Empire, but even in a single city, such as Ephesus, or Athens, or Rome, there was no fixed creed or uniform rule of worship, no comprehensive and coherent religious organisation. Every citizen was, indeed, expected to worship the gods (or some of the gods) whom the city worshipped, and if he failed to do so, he might, like Socrates, expose himself to the charge of atheism. But polytheism was essentially elastic and eclectic; and the gods worshipped in different cities, and even by different citizens of the same city, varied very widely. The priests of the various deities did not form a class apart, nor were they preachers of morality. There was no antagonism between the religious and the civil power, no antithesis of Church and State. Religion, both in Greece and in Rome, was in a very real sense civic or national, and was only beginning to become, in some degree, more personal, subjective, and self-conscious, and to regard itself as in some measure independent of civic life. With the growth of the Roman Empire and the mingling of East and West, Oriental cults, in which individualism was more strongly marked, had begun to spread, and a more cosmopolitan spirit was soon to make itself felt. And with the advent of the Imperial system the rapid spread of Caesar-worship (of which we shall say more hereafter) was just beginning to supply a common religious bond which might unite every portion of the Empire. But these tendencies

had not reached their full development when Christianity first appeared.[1]

It is now almost time for us to turn to the New Testament, and to examine Christ's intention for the Church, and His method with regard to the selection and training of those who were to constitute it. Yet, before we do this, one further inquiry is necessary. We ought first to look at the Divine Method generally with regard to men, for that will assuredly throw some light upon the method of Christ. We must not assume *a priori* that Christ's method will exactly coincide with it; but we shall not be surprised if it should prove to do so. What, then, can we gather, either from Natural Religion or from the Old Testament revelation, to be the fundamental principles of the Divine Method with regard to mankind? There are two principles which seem to be plain beyond dispute:—*First, God always respects human freedom, both in the sphere of moral action and in the sphere of intellectual belief.*[2] There is no coercion of

[1] An excellent general account of the main features of Greek religion, by Professor Percy Gardner, will be found in Gardner and Jevons' *Manual of Greek Antiquities*. For some leading features of later Greco-Roman religion, see Boissier, *La Religion romaine* and *Fin du paganisme*, and T. R. Glover, *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*.

[2] Cp. *Epistle to Diognetus*, chap. vii. ὡς σώζων ἔπεμψεν, ὡς πείθων, οὐ βιαζόμενος· βία γὰρ οὐ πρόσεστι τῷ θεῷ.

In Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, ch. x. § 1, there are some striking remarks on the fact that it is possible without absurdity to deny God's will, attributes, and existence.

human will: there is freedom to sin. There is no coercion of human belief: there is freedom to deny God. There are no overwhelming miracles to demonstrate belief mathematically; no immediate and certain punishments to enforce absolute obedience by temporal sanctions. God is a God who often hides Himself: He gives a partial revelation. He gives light enough for those who wish to walk by it. He shows Himself on the side of right in the long-run.[1] But He demands a response on the part of man; He insists on a venture of faith; and it is only to him who hath that He vouchsafes to give more. *Second, God uses human instruments for His revelation and for the spiritual guidance of men.* His message is delivered "in many fragments and in many manners" by patriarchs, judges, teachers, prophets—imperfect men of like passions with those whom they taught. The treasure is conveyed in earthen vessels. Truth is mingled with error, the human element with the divine, the finite with the infinite. Historical investigation of the Old Testament has shown us what the process was. We can see the gradual transition from "monolatry," the emergence of a purer monotheism and a higher morality, the deep-

[1] Cp. Butler, *Analogy*, part i. ch. iii.; and Pascal, *Pensées*, Partie II. Art. xiii. 2 (ed. 1779, vol. ii. p. 293), "Il y a assez de lumière pour ceux qui ne désirent que de voir, et assez d'obscurité pour ceux qui ont une disposition contraire. . . .

Ce qui y paroît (sc. dans le monde) ne marque ni une exclusion totale, ni une présence manifeste de Divinité, mais *la présence d'un Dieu qui se cache*: tout porte ce caractère."

ening apprehension of immortality. The painful struggle is conducted through human agency. Religion is handed down from generation to generation by the contact of mind with mind and heart with heart. A few are chosen who are to teach and to train others, and to hand on to them the lamp of truth. Wholesale revelation is the exception; human instruments are the rule.

We now turn to the Gospel records themselves, and we ask what principles we can discern as to Christ's method for His Church. If we are to find them, we must take a wide survey of the Gospels, not looking only to the passages where the word "Church" occurs, but considering Christ's whole teaching and training of His disciples, His whole line of policy and action. Two principles may at once be stated as clearly demonstrable if the Gospel records are worthy of credit:—

I. *Christ intended to found a visible Divine Society upon earth to perpetuate His work; and this intention was primary, not subsidiary.*

II. *This Divine Society He represented as being separate from, and in some sense antagonistic to, the World; and membership in it must involve sacrifice.*

These two statements must now be justified. With regard to the former, there are comparatively few people who would deny Christ's intention to found some kind of Society; but there are many who attach but little weight to this intention, and regard it as quite a secondary or even negligible

matter. This is almost inevitably the position of those who adopt the "eschatological" interpretation of the Gospels, which is now so widely current.[1] To another school Christ appears to have been primarily a great moral or spiritual teacher, comparable to Socrates or Aristotle, who attracted hearers, and gave precepts by which individual men might regulate their lives on earth and attain salvation hereafter. For this school the essence of Christianity lies almost entirely in the excellence of Christ's example, or in a few simple principles laid down in the Sermon on the Mount or elsewhere in His teaching, *e.g.* the Fatherhood of God, the duty of self-sacrifice, the ideal of brotherly love. That is a view which commends itself not only to a large mass of popular undenominationalism at the present time, but also to some critics of great learning and ability. But it seems impossible to justify it by any fair and well-proportioned examination of the New Testament as a whole.[2]

The evidence is so abundant that it is difficult even to summarise it here. It is, of course, true that the word ἐκκλησία is only found twice in the Gospels, both times in the First Gospel, and that some scholars have proposed to omit these verses as interpolations. But that is surely a desperate expedient of *a priori* criticism; such an interpolation, according to Dr.

[1] For the eschatological theory generally, see Appendix, Note C, p. 350.

[2] Cp. Dr. Armitage Robinson's *Vision of Unity*, pp. 31-35. The "moral" theory is presented most forcibly in Dr. Harnack's writings.

Hort, would be unexampled.[1] The two passages must be taken into account. One of them (St. Matt. xviii. 17) at least points to the fact that Christian disciples were to form a "congregation" with recognised rules of discipline. The other (St. Matt. xvi. 18), which contains the great promise to St. Peter—whatever interpretation we may put upon that promise—certainly tells us of an ἐκκλησία, an organised Society of disciples and believers, which was to be built upon a foundation of rock and to prevail against its enemies.[2] Nor need we be surprised that the word "Church" only occurs twice in the Gospels. No one who is familiar with their unsystematic character will expect to find in them a detailed exposition of the theory of the Church, any more than he would expect to find a detailed exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity.

But if we look for the *thing* apart from the *name*, we do not lack evidence. "Wherever," says Dr. Hort, "we find disciples and discipleship in the Gospels, there we are dealing with what was a direct preparation for the founding of the ἐκκλησία."[3] We find that our Lord's method was not promiscuous preaching, nor wholesale working of miracles, but that in the main He acted through human

[1] Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 9.

[2] On these two texts in St. Matthew, cp. Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 11; Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, ch. i.; Plummer, *Exegetical Commentary on St. Matthew*, *ad loc.*

[3] Hort, *op. cit.* pp. 19-20.

instruments. He made a few disciples, still fewer Apostles; He associated with them, taught them day by day, tried their faith, made them witnesses of His resurrection, gave them the command to evangelise all the world, instructed them as to the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.[1] He instituted Sacraments: one, Baptism, to be the Sacrament of initiation into the Church; another, the Holy Eucharist, to be the means of preserving the spiritual life of members of the Church; and in both cases participation in the Sacrament would be a visible token of membership in a visible society. Further, in all His teaching nothing is more frequent or more prominent than His language about the Kingdom of Heaven, or of God. As to the relation of the Kingdom of God to the Church widely different views have been held, for a detailed discussion of which I may refer to the lectures delivered on this foundation eight years ago by the Bishop of Exeter.[2] It is true that we cannot transfer directly to the Church all that is said in the Gospels about the Kingdom of God; but it is not less true that there is an extremely close connection between the two, and that the Church was intended to be the earthly anticipation and representative

[1] Our Lord's training of the Apostles is treated very instructively in Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*, where His respect for their freedom and individuality is well brought out.

[2] Robertson, *Regnum Dei* (Bampton Lectures, 1901). The subject has also been treated recently from a different point of view by Dr. Walpole in his interesting Paddock Lectures on *The Kingdom of God: What it is, and how we enter it* (1909).

of the Kingdom—"the Kingdom of God in the making."[1]

Once more, it is plain that the action taken by the Apostles after Pentecost has a very important bearing upon the interpretation of our Lord's intention. The Apostles had the best means of knowing what our Lord's intention was. If they did not understand it, it is not probable that we shall ever do so. And their interpretation is plain. They set themselves at once to build up a visible society which should carry on Christ's work. We shall examine presently the Church of the Acts and of the Epistles. Here we need only note that never for a moment did the Apostles doubt that Christ had commissioned them to build up and perpetuate a visible Church. Perhaps I cannot conclude this part of the argument better than by referring to a book of nearly fifty years ago—a great book of wonderful insight and permanent value, less read now than it deserves, the work of one who was not an orthodox believer—I mean *Ecce Homo*. Let any one who believes that Jesus Christ did not, as an essential part of his plan, intend to found a visible Divine Society, read the first fourteen chapters of *Ecce Homo*, and ask himself whether the argument contained in them misrepresents the Gospel record.[2]

[1] The phrase is used by Bishop Robertson (*Regnum Dei*, p. 359) in describing Albert Ritschl's view. Cp. Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 19.

[2] Sir J. Seeley goes too far in *identifying* the Kingdom with the

And, in point of fact, our Lord's method of founding a Divine Society is in entire congruity with the place of religion in human nature. True religion must always have both its individual and its corporate side. There can be no true religion without individual effort, individual grasp, individual sacrifice. Each human soul must appropriate the truth and make its personal response. In this sense religion is the relation of the human soul to God. We shall see that Christ did not neglect this side of things. One aspect of His teaching was intensely individualistic. But a bare individualism is inadequate. True religion is also social and corporate. In religion, as in secular life, man is a πολιτικὸν ζῶον, a social animal, and the isolated man is abnormal, either superhuman or infra-human. The common relation of the members to the head involves also a common relation one to another in the body; and the normal method of kindling and sustaining religious life is by human transmission and contact.

We now turn to the second principle—that this Divine Society is represented as separate from, and in some sense antagonistic to, the world,[1] and that membership in it involves sacrifice. The evidence

Church, but this does not destroy the value of his exposition of the essentially corporate nature of Christianity. For the main contentions of *Ecce Homo*, see a review by Dean Church in his *Occasional Papers*, vol. ii.

[1] We may postpone until a later lecture the question whether this separation and antagonism were intended to be merely a temporary phase. See p. 310.

for this in the Gospels is surely overwhelming. We have, in the first place, the clear and repeated warnings (such as that contained in the first of the two texts which I chose for this lecture) by which our Lord discouraged the casual hearer and the half-hearted follower. He who would be a disciple must take up his Cross; he must count the cost; he must lose his life if he would find it; he must not expect to fare better than his Master; he must be prepared to encounter his worst foes in his own household, and to be set at variance with his own parents. He must not shrink from persecution or from being hated of all men for Christ's sake. He must realise that his Master had not come to send peace on earth, but a sword.[1]

Christ, we thus see, did not make it an easy matter for a man to become His disciple, a member of His Society. And this is consonant with His persistent refusal to attract followers promiscuously, or to effect wholesale conversions. His miracles were not of the thaumaturgic kind.[2] He did not

[1] See such passages as St. Matt. v. 10-12, x. 34-39, xx. 22-28; St. Mark viii. 34-37, x. 23, 29, 38-45; St. Luke ix. 23-26, xii. 51-53; St. John xii. 25, xv. 18-21, xvi. 1-3. And compare Acts xiv. 22; 1 Thess. iii. 3; 1 St. Peter iii. iv.; 1 St. John iii. 13.

[2] He was certainly not the "thaumaturge malgré lui" of Renan's imagination (*Vie de Jésus*, ch. xvi.). Nothing is more striking than the contrast between the miracles of the Four Gospels and those narrated in the Apocryphal Gospels (cp. Donehoo's *Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ*, in which a large number of these stories are given in narrative form). Rousseau (*Lettres écrites de la Montagne*, partie i. lettre iii.) has some interesting remarks on Christ's miracles: "On voit dans

call down fire from heaven, or invoke legions of angels. He refused to make Himself king; He withdrew repeatedly from the crowds which pursued Him; He made faith a condition of acceptance; He was careful to sift and to select. At the end of His earthly life He had made only a few disciples, and His career appeared to end in failure so far as the number and importance of His converts was concerned. In His eyes numbers meant nothing, sincerity and self-sacrifice everything.[1]

The idea of the separation of the disciples from the world may be traced clearly in all the Gospels; but it is in the Fourth Gospel that the conception of the World (κόσμος) in antagonism to the band of disciples appears most distinctly; indeed, the word occurs more frequently and more emphatically in the Johannine writings than in all the rest of the New Testament.[2] The contrast of Church and World appealed, no doubt, to the individual bent of St. John's mind and to his longer experience of the developing antagonism; but there is nothing in his language which is inconsistent with, or alien from,

l'Évangile que ceux de Jésus étoient tous utiles, mais ils étoient sans éclat, sans apprêt, sans pompe" . . . "Tant s'en faut que l'objet réel des miracles de Jésus fut d'établir la foi, qu'au contraire il commençoit par exiger la foi avant que de faire le miracle." A strong argument might also be drawn from the Temptation of Christ.

[1] Reference may be made to such passages as St. Matt. viii. 4, ix. 30, xii. 16, 39, xiii. 58, xvi. 4; St. Mark i. 44, iii. 2, vi. 5, 6, vii. 24-26, viii. 11-26; St. Luke iv. 41, v. 16, ix. 55; St. John xviii. 36.

[2] For the usage of κόσμος in the New Testament, and especially in the Johannine writings, see Appendix, Note D, p. 352.

the language of the Synoptists. He has merely developed the already perceived contrast. He sees the World lying in darkness, and refusing to recognise first Him who came to be its light, and then those who bore witness to that light. The World hates the Church, as it had hated Christ. The disciples must be in the World, but not of it. They had been chosen out of it for the purpose of bearing witness, and to become assimilated to it again would be to extinguish their power of witness.

Christ, then, left behind Him upon earth a body of disciples, with the Apostles at their head, whom He intended to form a visible Society which should perpetuate His work, and to live a life which would bring them into constant and painful collision with the World. Thus He founded a Church; but He did not, like some religious leaders, leave behind Him a detailed constitution or code of laws; He did not compose any sacred writings in which His teaching was contained; He did not even prescribe any code for moral action. "On the greater number of questions on which men require moral guidance He has left no direction whatever," says the author of *Ecce Homo*.[1] He was content to lay down principles and to inspire motive. With regard to what we might call a "constitution" for the Church, we have the scantiest records of any positive directions. We have no means of determining what injunctions He gave to the Apostles

[1] *Ecce Homo*, ch. xiii. Cp. Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 11.

during the "Great Forty Days," when He spoke to them of "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." That He gave some directions it is surely not unreasonable to suppose, but when men argue that He *must* have enjoined this or that ordinance or custom, they are on dangerous ground. So far as we can discover His method of dealing with men, it would have been alien from it for Him to have laid down a detailed policy or minute regulations; and, from the fact that the Apostles were plainly in doubt on such a point as the treatment of Gentile converts, we may infer with certainty that they had received no directions on at least one point of the greatest importance which was soon to arise for settlement.[1] He had indeed promised the Church the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Who was to lead them into all truth, and to show them what they were to say and to do. The earliest body of the disciples, under the superintendence of the Apostles and the guidance of the Spirit, were charged with the duty of working out the institutions and policy of the Church in the light of experience. We should naturally expect to find a process of development, and in the Acts of the Apostles and the Apostolic Epistles we have preserved to us the record—a fragmentary record, no doubt—of the first growth of the Church.

All that we can do here is to note some main

[1] Cp. Latham, *The Risen Master*, ch. xi., where there is an excellent discussion as to the guidance which the Apostles may be reasonably supposed to have received.

characteristics of the Church in the New Testament, so far as they concern our present purpose.

1. The Church is a visible society of believers, organised, if only in a rudimentary fashion. Every Christian believer becomes by a visible rite — Baptism — a member of the Body of Christ. There is no such thing as individualism, there are no isolated believers. We do not find first a multitude of individual believers, who, as an afterthought, deemed it expedient to form themselves into a Church. The Church is prior, as it were, to the individual. In Archbishop Temple's forcible and often-quoted words, "Throughout the teaching of the Apostles we see that it is the Church which comes first, and the members of it afterwards. Men were not brought to Christ and then determined that they would live in a community. . . . In the New Testament, on the contrary, the Kingdom of Heaven is already in existence, and men are invited into it. The Church takes its origin, not in the will of man, but in the will of the Lord Jesus Christ."[1]

2. The Church gradually outgrows the restrictions of the Judaism out of which it sprang, and realises that it is cosmopolitan, world-wide, Catholic. The process was of necessity gradual: we can trace it, though imperfectly, in the Acts. The new Christian ἐκκλησία did not at first realise its distinctness from the old Jewish ἐκκλησία. The first disciples

[1] *Twelve Sermons preached at the Consecration of Truro Cathedral:* sermon ii.

continued to worship in the Temple. St. Stephen was haled before the Sanhedrin as a recusant Jew; and those who were scattered abroad in the persecution which followed his death preached the Word to none but to the Jews only. It needed a vision to convince St. Peter that God was not a respecter of nationalities; nor was the status of the Gentile converts settled without keen disputes and anxious deliberation. Even when the inclusion of the Gentiles had been accepted, we find St. Paul making it his practice to appeal first to the Jews in every city, and to go to their synagogues; and the worship and institutions of Christianity were undoubtedly affected by those of the synagogue, out of which they sprang.[1] But the severance was only a question of time. The Sanhedrin had from the first regarded Christianity as an enemy, and it was from the Jews in Asia and Greece that persecution repeatedly arose.[2] With the growth in the number of Gentile converts the centre of gravity shifts from Jerusalem to Antioch and Ephesus, Corinth and Rome; and although many years elapsed before the pagan world and the Roman authorities realised that Christianity was something more than a Jewish sect,[3] the Church had within a

[1] Acts ii. 46, iii. 1, vi. 12, x. 34, xi. 19, xv. 1-31, xvii. 4-10. Cp. E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, pp. 30-31; Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 62; Henson, *Apostolic Christianity*, pp. 9, 31.

[2] Acts iv. 17, v. 28, ix. 2, xiv. 5, 19, xvii. 5, xviii. 12.

[3] See lecture ii. For the treatment of Christians as a Jewish sect, cp. Acts xviii. 14, 15 *ζητήματα περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς* (Gallio); Acts xxv. (Festus).

very few years become fully conscious of her universal mission. Our Lord Himself, unless the Gospel record is false, had proclaimed this universality, but the disciples did not at first grasp the full import of His words.[1] By no one was it grasped more firmly or expressed more clearly than by St. Paul, who taught that Christianity implied the ignoring for purposes of membership of all distinctions of nationality, sex, or social rank, that the Christian's citizenship was in heaven, and that in Christ there was "neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free."[2]

3. It is evident that if a body so wide-spread and so cosmopolitan as the Church was becoming was to remain coherent, it must possess some bond of unity and some power of discipline. Wherever converts were made in any city, there we find a local ἐκκλησία springing up. In the Acts and the Epistles the prevalent sense of ἐκκλησία is that of a local Church — the ἐκκλησία in Ephesus or in Corinth — the ἐκκλησίαι of Judæa or Syria — even the ἐκκλησία in the house of Aquila and Priscilla. There was, of course, no idea of the possibility of the existence of "Churches" in the modern sense, *i.e.* of rival Christian bodies in the same place. But there were these various local ἐκκλησίαι, and, as yet, there was no fully developed central authority to govern them. In what sense, then, was there a

[1] See Appendix, Note B, p. 348.

[2] Col. iii. 11; cp. Eph. ii. 13.

real unity, and how was it preserved? How did each ἐκκλησία maintain internal discipline, and how were the different ἐκκλησίαι bound together? We must not fall into the mistake of idealising the early Christian communities. St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians would alone suffice to prove their frailty, their factions and jealousies, their need of discipline. From his writings, too, we may derive evidence as to the way in which unity and discipline were maintained. We find St. Paul appealing to the actual command of Christ, to the Old Testament, to his own Apostolic authority, to the custom of the Churches.[1] We find him laying down a strict moral standard for those who are "within"; and, while he refuses to judge those who are "without," he calls on his converts to separate themselves from any brethren who refused to observe that standard.[2] At Corinth and elsewhere we have evidence of a process amounting to excommunication.[3] Discipline was strong, because there was an appeal to the *esprit de corps* of a small band who regarded themselves as separate from the World (ἅγιοι), and as brothers one to another

[1] For the failings of the Corinthian Church, see especially 1 Cor. i. 11 (factions); v. i. (incest); xi. 21 (abuses of the Lord's Supper); xii., xiii. (abuses of χαρίσματα); 2 Cor. x. 8-10 (defiance of apostolic authority). For St. Paul's appeal to different kinds of authority, see Henson, *Apostolic Christianity*, pp. 7-15, and references there given to 1 and 2 Corinthians.

[2] 1 Cor. v. 9-13.

[3] 1 Cor. v. 3-7; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14; Gal. i. 8, 9; Titus iii. 10, 11. Cp. Henson, *Apostolic Christianity*, part i. pp. 28-34.

(ἀδελφοί, ἀδελφότης), and who acknowledged Christianity to be not only a creed but a way of life (ὁδός).[1] Discipline was necessary for self-preservation, and to men who were living at so short an interval after the first coming of Christ, and with so keen an expectation of His speedy return, the hindrances to discipline were less powerful than they afterwards became.[2] With regard to the relation of the local ἐκκλησία to the whole body, the universal ἐκκλησία, our information is only partial. It is in the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians (A.D. 57-60) that we find the idea of the universal ἐκκλησία most strongly emphasised by St. Paul, though it is doubtful whether it can be truly said that in his other epistles St. Paul only uses the word in the local sense.[3] In any case St. Paul was not devising an original theory so much as drawing out what was implicit in Christian consciousness of membership. The independence of the local ἐκκλησίαι may easily be exaggerated, and has, I think, been exaggerated by so great a scholar as Dr. Hort.[4] It was natural that at first there should

[1] For names applied to the disciples in the New Testament, see Appendix, Note E, p. 354.

[2] For the expectation of the *Parousia*, and the appeal based upon it, see 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23; 2 Thess. ii.; 1 Cor. xv. 23, and cp. Note F (pp. 145-8) in Milligan's *Commentary* on the Thessalonians.

[3] Cp. 1 Cor. x. 32, xii. 28, quoted by Dr. Armitage Robinson in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, s.v. "Church."

[4] For an examination of Dr. Hort's theory, see Appendix, Note F, p. 355

be no ready-made central government; but there was a real feeling of unity pervading the whole Christian body, there was frequent intercommunication between different Churches, and St. Paul himself, by the exercise of his Apostolic authority, exerted a strong unifying influence over all the Gentile Churches. It was he, above all, who refused to admit the possibility of splitting Christianity into a dual system, with a Jewish Church and a Gentile Church side by side.[1]

This hasty and fragmentary survey reveals to us the early Church with an organisation as yet rudimentary, but nevertheless as a coherent body, strong in its unity of spirit and purpose, and in its distinctness from the World. It was in the World but not of it, a harbour of refuge from the World, the instrument of the World's redemption. What was the attitude of the World towards the Church?

The large majority of individual men who came into contact with Christianity during the first century doubtless misunderstood it, and turned away from it with contempt and dislike. The Jews at Rome had heard of it only as a sect everywhere spoken against: to them it seemed subversive of their national law and customs.[2] To the average Gentile citizen of Ephesus, Athens, or Rome, it appeared to be a new variety of Judaism, of a specially fanatical and superstitious kind. Those

[1] Armitage Robinson, *The Vision of Unity*, pp. 17, 18: "Two bodies and one spirit was a thought unthinkable to him."

[2] Acts xvii. 6, xxi. 28, xxviii. 22.

who became Christians, he saw, cut themselves off from family and friends, from social intercourse and the religious observances of their neighbours, and bound themselves by a new allegiance. He put them down as sullen misanthropes—"enemies of the human race."[1] If we look, not at individuals, but at the religious and civil authorities of the time, we find that the Jewish hierarchy and the rulers of the synagogues persecuted the Church wherever they could.[2] The Roman authorities were at first less inclined to interfere. We meet with several instances in the Acts where they plainly regarded the Christian disciples as a new Jewish sect; and Judaism was a tolerated religion. It will be more convenient to postpone to the next lecture a detailed examination of the conflict between Christianity and the Roman Empire; but in this place we may notice that before the end of the New Testament period Christianity had been excepted from the general Roman policy of toleration, and that it was already subjected to different treatment from that which was meted out to Judaism, the only other sternly monotheistic religion with which

[1] For the extant heathen notices of Christianity, dating from the second century, see Bigg, *Origins of Christianity*, ch. xix. The estimate of Tacitus, who, writing in the reign of Trajan, refers to the Neronian persecution, no doubt represents a view common at Rome in the reign of Nero (*Annals*, xv. 44 "odio humani generis").

[2] See references given on p. 26 (note 2). In a later generation Tertullian wrote, "Synagogas Judaeorum fontes persecutionum" (*Scorp.* 10).

Rome had to deal.[1] This was mainly because it was felt to be, or to have the power of becoming, a dangerous solvent of the existing social system.[2] It was recognised as being not merely a set of religious or moral doctrines, but a society which demanded from its members a strict obedience and a loyal allegiance. With regard to opinions apart from practice the Roman Government was extremely tolerant, and, as to worship, Sir W. Ramsay truly says that the ordinary pagans "did not care two straws whether their neighbour worshipped twenty gods or twenty-one."[3] It was not simply as holders of unusual opinions, nor as worshippers of a strange god, that Christians were persecuted, but as members of an exclusive and potentially dangerous society.[4] There were, no doubt, many different causes which were the immediate occasions of conflict (*e.g.* interference with trade interests), but the paramount underlying cause must be found in this fact. And we shall observe that before the end of this period Christians were subject to persecution simply as being Christians—*propter nomen ipsum*—and not only for the crimes with which "the Name" was supposed to be associated.

[1] See especially 1 St. Peter, and the Apocalypse.

[2] Cp. Mommsen in the *Expositor*, 1893 (series iv. vol. viii. pp. 1-7). "The political order of the ancient world, and especially of the Roman world, rested on the nationality of the religion. . . . The severing of the nationality from the Creed, in basing the religion on humanity, is the very essence of the Christian revolution."

[3] Ramsay, *The Church and the Roman Empire*, ch. vii.

[4] This point is treated more in detail in lecture ii. See pp. 41-56.

Leaving all further remarks about persecution to the second lecture, we may bring this portion of our inquiry to a close with a glance at the situation at the end of the New Testament period, as it is revealed to us in the pages of the Apocalypse, which I believe to have been written by St. John the Apostle late in the reign of Domitian (A.D. 95-96).[1] Like 1 St. Peter, this book bears the marks of a time of fiery persecution. On the one side we have the persecuted Church, with the blood of its martyrs being freely shed: on the other the persecuting World, represented by the Roman Empire. It is probable that the Beast who is depicted as coming up out of the sea is the Emperor Domitian, while the Beast from the land is the organisation of the worship of the Emperor, which was especially powerful in the province of Asia. Rome, the imperial city, with its seven hills, is the Great Harlot, drunk with the blood of the saints.[2] The refusal of the Christians to join in the worship of the Emperor, which was gradually becoming a great religious bond for the whole Empire, was one of their chief offences, and the challenge to take part in this worship was one of the most simple and natural tests which could be offered to an incriminated Christian. St. John looks upon this fierce

[1] For the date of the Apocalypse and the situation described in it, see Appendix to lecture i., Note G, p. 357.

[2] Rev. xiii. 1-8, 11-18; xvii. 1-14. Compare notes *ad loc.* in Dr. Swete's *Apocalypse*, and his Introduction, especially pp. lxxxi, xci, cii.

conflict, which he represents with such a wealth of apocalyptic imagery, in no spirit of despair, but with the eye of faith and confidence. He never asks for compromise; he never dreams of defeat. He, more than any other writer of the New Testament, had dwelt on the fundamental antagonism of the Church and the World; and in his extreme old age he, the last survivor of the Apostolic band, sees the battle already joined. To him it was incredible that there could be any doubt about the issue. The faith of the Church would win the victory that was destined to overcome the World, and the kingdom of the World would in truth become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

LECTURE II

THE CHURCH OVERCOMING THE WORLD

Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis et disciplinae unitate et spei foedere. TERTULLIAN, *Apology*, ch. xxxix.

II

THE CHURCH OVERCOMING THE WORLD

St. Mark xii. 16-17 : "And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Caesar's. And Jesus said unto them, Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

1 Corinthians i. 26, 27 : "For behold your calling, brethren, how that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called : but God chose the foolish things of the world, that he might put to shame them that are wise ; and God chose the weak things of the world, that he might put to shame the things that are strong."

In the opening lecture we made it our endeavour to discover what was Christ's intention for the Church in her relations to the World. We fancied that we could trace in the Gospel records two great leading principles. One was that Christ intended to found a visible Divine Society upon earth, which should perpetuate His work; the other, that He always represented this Society as separate from the World and in some sense antagonistic to it, and declared that membership in this Society must involve sacrifice. Then, turning from the Gospels to the remaining books of the New Testament, we saw that these two leading principles were accepted

by the Apostles and the Early Church as essential conditions of their work, and were carried out in practice. We found that, as a matter of fact, the Early Church did form a visible Society, gradually severing itself from its Judaic origins,—a Society with marked characteristics of its own, and a strong bond of coherence among its members. From the first it was persecuted by the Jews; from a very early date it had come into conflict with the Roman Empire; by the time of the Apocalypse there was a clear antagonism between the Church and the World-power as represented by Imperial Rome. When we took leave of the New Testament writings at the close of the first century we saw a struggle in which, doubtless, the writer of the Apocalypse confidently expected the Church to triumph, but in which, according to all human calculations, she could only look for cruel sufferings and final extermination. To outward appearance a new Oriental sect, hated by the populace as sullen and superstitious fanatics, had been attacked by the greatest government which the world had yet seen. What hope could there be of its escape? What chance of its victory? No Roman official, no Greek philosopher of the Flavian period would have allowed that there was any doubt of the issue. Yet we know that only two centuries and a quarter after the death of Domitian the first Ecumenical Council of the Christian Church was held at Nicaea, at the summons and under the protection of the Emperor Constantine; that the Roman Government had by

this time abandoned a policy of persecution for one of favour and patronage; and that the Church of the Nicene period represented a powerful organisation almost co-extensive with the Empire, and included among its members a considerable proportion of the total population and a still larger proportion of the sounder elements of society.[1] To-day our task will be to ask how this vast change came about, and to disentangle from the complex, though sadly fragmentary, evidence the main stages and the main causes of this memorable revolution.

It will perhaps be best to consider first the policy of the World and the World-power towards the Church, and then to examine the attitude of the Church towards the World. We noticed in the last lecture that the Roman Empire had already embarked upon a policy of persecution, but we were obliged to defer any further inquiry into details and methods. Even to-day we must be content with a few salient features. Persecution is written large across the whole period, but there have been great controversies as to the extent and the continuity of persecution, the number of the martyrs, the reasons which led to persecution, the laws and the procedure by which the Christians were con-

[1] For the probable number of Christians at the time of the Edict of Milan, see pp. 61, 62. The best account of the geographical expansion of Christianity will be found in Harnack's *Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. The second (revised and enlarged) edition of the English translation (1908) contains valuable maps illustrating the spread of Christianity down to A.D. 325.

demned, and the effects which persecution produced upon the Church. We must neither digress into a general history of Christianity, nor lose ourselves amidst the details of recorded persecutions; but some knowledge of these points is necessary to our inquiry, and the subject is one of engrossing interest upon which much light has been thrown during recent years.[1]

Christian tradition has sometimes spoken of ten persecutions, and has connected each with the name of some individual emperor, beginning with Nero

[1] It may be convenient to give the full titles of some modern works to which reference will be made, by abbreviated titles, in the notes to this lecture:—Mommsen, "Der Religionsfrevel nach römischem Recht," in *Historische Zeitschrift*, vol. lxiv. (1890); P. Allard, *Histoire des persécutions* (3 vols., 3rd ed., 1903-7), and two more popular works by the same writer, *Dix Leçons sur le martyre* (1907), and *Le Christianisme et l'Empire romain* (2nd ed., 1897); Le Blant, *Les persécuteurs et les martyrs*, (1893); Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* (2nd ed., 1889-90); H. B. Workman, *Persecution in the Early Church* (2nd ed., 1906); Sir W. M. Ramsay, *The Church and the Roman Empire* (2nd ed., 1893); E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History*, 1906 (a revised and enlarged edition of *Christianity and the Roman Government*); K. J. Neumann, *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche* (1890); C. F. Arnold, *Die neronische Christenverfolgung* (1888); B. W. Henderson, *Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero* (1903); A. J Mason, *The Persecution of Diocletian* (1876), *Historic Martyrs of the Primitive Church* (1905); F. C. Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity* (1894). Some of the most interesting Acts of the Martyrs are now easily accessible in O. von Gebhardt's *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten* (1902); for others reference must be made to the *Acta Sanctorum*, or to Ruinart's *Acta Martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859).

and ending with Diocletian and his colleagues. Such a view is misleading if it causes us to overlook the fact that during this whole period Christianity was, in theory at least, a proscribed religion, and that, although the proscription was unevenly and intermittently enforced, the sword was always suspended over the Christian's head, and might at any time descend upon him.[1]

We ask first, Why was Christianity singled out for persecution? The answer was partially anticipated in the last lecture.[2] Christianity was proscribed not merely because it was a new and strange religion, but because Christians formed an exclusive and potentially dangerous religious society. Christians were, in fact, persecuted not so much for individual beliefs as for being members of a Church, and of a Church which acknowledged no divided allegiance. But the answer needs amplification. We are met, for instance, by this difficulty. The Jews, no less than the Christians, were monotheists and exclusive. Why, then, were the Jews tolerated and the Christians proscribed? It does not appear to me that upon this question the last word has yet been written; but a number of facts are clear, and we can give at least a partial explanation. The general policy of the Roman Government was, we

[1] Cp. Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, i. 491, "The sword of Damocles hung over every Christian's neck." That this is no exaggeration will become evident in the course of this lecture. The heathen could always say to the Christian, "Non licet esse vos" (Tertullian, *Apol.* ch. iv.).

[2] See p. 32.

know, one of religious toleration, but this toleration was not absolute or unconditional; it was inspired by expediency and opportunism rather than by any abstract principles of justice and liberty. Roman religion was intensely national, intimately bound up with the safety and welfare of the State; and it was therefore considered to be the duty of the Government to enforce a certain measure of external religious observance upon every citizen.[1] But with the spread of Roman conquest we find a development in the Roman Pantheon. First Italian, then Greek, then Oriental deities were adopted, frequently by a process of identification with deities already recognised.[2] Polytheism was elastic, but the Government always reserved to itself the right of interference to prevent any moral scandals and any menace to social order. Two hundred years before Christ it repressed the Bacchanalian worship with a strong hand;[3] later it tried, though ineffectually, to put down (at least in Rome itself)

[1] Hardy, *Studies*, p. 3. Boissier, *Religion romaine*, i. pp. 12, 70, 71, etc. The Government did not concern itself with private *beliefs* apart from worship, and seldom interfered with *private* worship.

[2] Preller-Jordan, *Römische Mythologie* (3rd ed.), i. 19-29. For the influence of Oriental religions on the old Roman religion, cp. Glover, *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, ch. i.

[3] Livy xxxix. chs. 8-19. The text of the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus is given in Brun's *Fontes juris Romani antiqui*, 4th ed., p. 145. Mommsen ("Religionsfrevel," p. 400) regards the action of the Roman Government in suppressing the Bacchanalian worship as due to its determination to maintain good order in general rather than as a matter of *Religionspolizei*.

the worship of Isis, which it afterwards accepted and favoured.[1] Human sacrifices were forbidden in Africa,[2] and Claudius set himself to exterminate Druidism in Gaul.[3] These acts of interference were exceptional, but they suffice to show that, even amidst the decay of the State religion of Rome and the general prevalence of scepticism, the Roman Government did not recognise any unqualified liberty of worship even in the provinces, and still less in Italy and in Rome itself.

Long before it came into conflict with Christianity the Roman Government had found itself face to face with a religion which was not polytheistic and therefore comprehensive, but monotheistic and therefore exclusive. The Jews presented a difficult problem to the Roman statesman. They formed no inconsiderable element in the population of the Empire. Apart from Palestine, they were numerous in Alexandria and other Hellenistic cities, and in days when Orontes

[1] Dio Cassius xx. 47, xlii. 26, xlvii. 15; Tertullian, *Apol.* ch. 6; and other references given in Hardy, *Studies*, pp. 10-12. Mommsen ("Religionsfrevel," pp. 402-6) shows how it became impossible to prevent Roman citizens from worshipping the foreign gods whom non-citizens were allowed to worship. The old principle had been "ne qui nisi Romani dii neve quo alio more quam patrio colerentur" (Livy iv. 30), and complaints of "sacra externa" are frequent in the pages of Livy.

[2] Tertullian, *Apol.* ch. 9; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxx. i. 13; Hardy, *Studies*, p. 14.

[3] Suetonius, *Claudius*, ch. 25; Hardy, *l.c.*

had long mingled with Tiber, they found their way in increasing numbers to Rome.[1] To most educated Romans their creed appeared to be a barbarous and fanatical superstition, their mode of life unsocial or antisocial: that they sought to make proselytes was an added offence.[2] Nevertheless Julius Cæsar thought it expedient to grant them exceptional privileges—the free exercise of their religion, and exemption from military service. Augustus excused them from appearing in court on

[1] Harnack (*Mission and Expansion*, book i. ch. i.) has an interesting discussion as to the diffusion of Judaism under the Early Empire. He is inclined to think that the Jewish population of the Empire may have amounted to four or four and a half millions, of whom one million lived in Egypt, and more than that number in Syria. He estimates the number of Jews in Rome under Tiberius at 10,000; and in spite of the deportation of 4000 able-bodied Jews by that emperor, they were still more numerous under Claudius, who did not venture to expel them. But the evidence for so large an estimate of the total Jewish population must be considered somewhat meagre. See also Mommsen, *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, vol. ii. ch. xi.

[2] The antipathy of the educated aristocratic Roman towards Judaism is nowhere so fully or so forcibly expressed as in Tacitus, *Histories*, v. chs. 2-5, 8, "teterrima gens," "despectissima pars servientium," etc. Cp. also Juvenal, *Satire* xiv. 97-106; Quintilian, *Instit. Orat.* iii. 7, 21. Cicero (*Pro Flacco*, ch. xxviii.) calls it "barbara superstitio" (see Hardy, *Studies*, p. 18). At the same time it is undeniable that Judaism appealed to many cultivated people as a philosophical monotheistic system (Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, i. 11), and men and women who were in search of religious novelty dabbled eclectically in portions of the Jewish ritual, *e.g.* observing the Sabbath; cp. Horace, *Satires*, i. 9. 70. For the whole subject see Schürer, *Jewish People*, II. ii. 291-316.

the Sabbath;[1] and in no reign except that of the insane Caligula was any attempt made to force them to join in the worship of the emperors.[2] These concessions did not, indeed, avert the war which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem, but even after that great catastrophe similar privileges were given to all members of Jewish synagogues who registered themselves, obtained a licence, and paid the equivalent of the former Temple tax to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.[3] How are we to explain this tolerance for a religion which was rigid and unyielding, and which utterly refused to worship the gods of Rome as a condition of being allowed to worship its own God also? "It was a recognition, on however small a scale," Mr. Hardy admits in his careful and instructive study of this question,

[1] Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* xlv. ch. x. 6, 8, 12, 17. See Hardy, *Studies*, p. 18.

[2] Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.* xix. ch. v. 2. Claudius promptly reversed the action of Caligula, ascribing it to παραφροσύνη, and even Domitian did not attempt to force the Jews to recognise his divinity (Schürer, *op. cit.* II. ii. 268).

[3] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. ch. vi. 6 φόρον δὲ τοῖς ὁπουδηπότουν οὖσιν Ἰουδαίοις ἐπέβαλεν, δύο δραχμὰς ἕκαστον κελεύσας ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος εἰς τὸ Καπετώλιον φέρειν, ὥσπερ πρότερον εἰς τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις νεὼν συνετέλουν. Tertullian (*Apol.* 18) taunts the Jews with their *vectigalis libertas*. Cp. Dio Cassius lxvi. 7; and see Hardy, *Studies*, p. 24, and Mommsen, "Religionsfrevel," pp. 424-5.

As regards the fall of Jerusalem, Harnack (*op. cit.* p. 11) holds the view that "the destruction of the Temple by the Romans really destroyed nothing"; but is it not true to say that the Jews lost their political unity and political privileges, though they retained their religious privileges and were recognised as a *religio licita*? (Hardy, *l.c.*)

'of a State within the State";[1] and such a recognition is not of a piece with the general Roman policy. We can only find the explanation in expediency. Julius Cæsar and his successors thought toleration the lesser of two evils. As an exclusive religion, incompatible with the national religion of Rome, Judaism deserved suppression. Had it existed only on a very small scale, probably it would have been suppressed. On the other hand, had the Jews been more numerous and more aggressive than they were, so as to form a great and growing menace to the unity of the Empire, the Empire would have crushed them at all costs. As it was, Rome thought that extermination was unnecessary; and Rome was right. But the point to be observed is that under the general principles of Roman policy persecution of the Jews would have been perfectly legitimate, had it been thought desirable.

This digression will have prepared us for the better understanding of the imperial policy towards the Christian Church. If, logically, the Jew came under the ban of the Empire, so, and more so, did

[1] Hardy, *Studies*, p. 23. If the Jews were as numerous as Harnack is inclined to allow, and if this large Jewish population was due to successful propaganda rather than to the natural fertility of the Jewish race, the large measure of toleration shown by the Government of the Empire is all the more difficult to understand; but the fact remains that the authorities did *not* consider Judaism a menace to the Empire, and that experience proved them right. If it was not a menace before the destruction of Jerusalem, still less would it be so afterwards.

the Christian. Christianity was as exclusive as Judaism, and equally opposed to compromise and syncretism. It was more active and aggressive, and it was not, like Judaism, a national religion, but cosmopolitan and universal. For our purposes it is not necessary to determine exactly at what date the Roman Government distinguished Christianity from Judaism. Sooner or later it was bound to draw the distinction. The Roman bureaucracy and police were vigilant. The Jews often made serious charges against the Christians. When the Jews themselves were registered for worship the distinction would become clearer than before.[1] At all events, we know that the first direct collision, on any large scale, between Christianity and the central Government took place when Nero tried to divert to the Christians the guilt of his own incendiarism.[2] This

[1] For the period at which the Roman Government distinguished between Jews and Christians, see Mommsen, "Religionsfrevel," p. 423; Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 266-268; Hardy, *Studies*, p. 47; Arnold, *Neronische Christenverfolgung*, p. 115. Ramsay's refutation of the view maintained by K. J. Neumann (*Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche*, pp. 5-15), viz. that the distinction was not made until the end of Domitian's reign, appears to me conclusive.

[2] Tacitus, *Annals*, xv. 44 "ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos, et quaesitissimis poenis adfecit quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat. auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat; repressaque in praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursum erumpebat, non modo per Iudaeam, originem eius mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque. igitur primum correpti qui

led to the first fierce persecution, with all its ghastly punishments, and although the Christians were accused in the first instance as incendiaries and not as Christians, the investigation naturally led to fresh charges, *e.g.* magic, witchcraft, disloyalty, "hatred of civilised society."[1] We go forward a few years and we find a somewhat different state of things. In 1 St. Peter (the exact date of which is uncertain) and in the Apocalypse (probably A.D. 95-96) we see that Christians were liable to punishment merely for being Christians, and not for specific crimes popularly associated with Christianity.[2]

fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens haud proinde (*al.* perinde) in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis convicti (*al.* coniuncti) sunt."

There is no reason for doubting either the genuineness of this most important passage or its substantial accuracy. That there is no adequate evidence for supposing (*a*) that the sufferers in the Neronian persecution were not Christians, but Jews, or (*b*) that the Jews were first inculpated and shifted the blame on to the Christians, has, I think, been shown by Mr. Henderson in his excellent Appendix on "Christianity and the Government" (*Nero*, pp. 434-449).

[1] See Hardy, *Studies*, pp. 52-59; Henderson, *l.c.*; Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, ch. xi. There is no adequate evidence that Nero issued a general edict of persecution, or that the example set by him at Rome was widely followed in the provinces. By "odium humani generis" we must understand, as Ramsay points out, not hatred of mankind in general, but of the Roman world, *i.e.* of civilised society and civilised government.

[2] Ramsay's theory that persecution for "the Name" began with Vespasian has not found general acceptance. It would fall to the ground if the Apocalypse and 1 St. Peter could be shown to belong to the reign of Nero. The date of the Apocalypse is dis-

This also was evidently the state of affairs when Pliny wrote his celebrated letter to Trajan in 112,[1] and it is emphasised many times by Tertullian.[2]

cussed in Appendix to lecture i., Note G; there is more reason for assigning an early date (63-68) to 1 St. Peter; but the tradition that St. Peter was martyred in the Neronian persecution was by no means universal, and Ramsay's argument for the later date seems to me to deserve more consideration than it has received (see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, ch. xiii.). While it seems clear that under Nero Christians *could* have been condemned simply for "the Name," as "a police matter," as well as prosecuted on specific charges, I do not think that there is sufficient evidence that they *were* so treated, unless we accept the early date for the Apocalypse and 1 St. Peter. For the references to "the name" in those books, see 1 St. Peter iii. 15-17, iv. 14-16; Revelation ii. 13, xii. 11, xvii. 6.

[1] Ample discussions of Pliny's letter and Trajan's answer (Pliny, *Epist. ad Trajan.* x. 96, 97) will be found in Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, iii. 20, 50-56; Ramsay, *op. cit.* ch. x.; Hardy, *Studies*, ch. vi. Among the points on which Pliny had been in doubt was this: "*nomen ipsum*, si flagitiis careat, an *flagitia cohaerentia nomini*, puniantur." His actual procedure had been to ask the accused whether they were Christians, and, if they persisted in their confession, to order them to be executed, on the ground that their "pertinacia et inflexibilis obstinatio" were at any rate deserving of death. The punishment was independent of any investigation of particular charges; the worship of the Emperor was tendered as a test only to those who denied the faith. Trajan's answer plainly endorses the treatment of profession of "the Name" as a capital offence; but he concedes that (1) they need not be hunted out; (2) anonymous accusations were not to be admitted; (3) those who denied Christ and worshipped the gods should be pardoned.

[2] See especially *Apology*, ch. ii. "illud solum exspectatur, quod odio publico necessarium est, *confessio nominis non examinatio criminis*." Tertullian refers directly and scornfully to Trajan's answer (*ibid.*): "negat inquirendos ut innocentes, et mandat

The dispute as to the details of the transition is not really material to our argument. The main fact is undoubted. By the end of the first century, if not as early as the reign of Nero, it was a crime to be a Christian. The Christian was in theory an outlaw, and could at any time be treated as such if the authorities thought it expedient. It has sometimes been supposed that a special law was passed, or a special imperial edict directed, against the Christians. Mommsen has, I think, proved that this was not the case, and that the treatment of Christians was generally left to the magistrates as a matter of police administration.[1] This would help to account

puniendos ut nocentes." There is no evidence that Trajan introduced any new authorisation of persecution, and the Apologists sometimes refer to the rescript as a *mitigation* of persecution (*e.g.* Tertullian, *Apol.* ch. v.; cp. Hardy, *Studies*, pp. 88-89).

[1] The existence of special laws or edicts against the Christians is still maintained by Allard, *Dix Leçons sur le martyre*, ch. iii., "La Législation persécutrice," who also refers to some articles by M. Callewaert in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* (Louvain), 1901-2, which I have not seen. But the evidence seems to be scanty, and such a vague statement as that of Sulpicius Severus (*Chron.* ii. 29), who attributes laws and edicts absolutely forbidding Christianity to Nero, is worth very little. The view expressed by Mommsen in the article already referred to ("Religionsfrevel," in *Hist. Zeitschrift*, lxiv.) has been accepted in its main conclusions by almost all scholars. Mommsen denies (p. 396) the existence of any imperial edict against Christianity. He gives weight to the evidence of Tertullian, that Christians could be proceeded against on the charge of "*majestas*" (*Apology*, p. 28), but thinks that this was not the normal procedure, and that Christianity generally came into conflict with the large powers of "coercitio" which all the higher Roman magistrates possessed.

for the sporadic and spasmodic character of the persecutions during the first and second centuries. Much depended upon the character of the individual governor or local magistrate;[1] still more upon the state of popular feeling in a province or city.[2] Popular feeling with regard to Christians varied widely in different regions and at different times, but we can easily perceive that the possible causes of suspicion and hatred were manifold. It is worth

Thus it was a matter of administration, in which the discretion of the individual magistrate counted for much. The ground on which the magistrate proceeded against "the Name" was that the Name connoted a refusal to worship the State gods, and a consequent defiance of State authority (Hardy, *Studies*, p. 98). Mommsen's view does not involve any denial that Christians could be, and sometimes were, proceeded against on such specific charges as magic.

[1] In several recorded cases the magistrates evidently disliked the work of persecution, and dealt as leniently as possible with the Christians, trying to persuade them to sacrifice and be released. So it was in the case of Polycarp and of Apollonius; several other instances are collected by Mason, *Historic Martyrs*, p. 75. On the other hand some governors took pleasure in enforcing the severest penalties, *e.g.* the governor at Lyons in the famous persecution of Lyons and Vienne (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 1), and the governor of Numidia in the persecution of Valerian (Gebhardt, *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten*, pp. 135, 142).

[2] The rescript of Hadrian specially forbade governors to pay attention to popular clamour apart from evidence (Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 322). The violence of the crowd is conspicuous in many martyrdoms, *e.g.* that of Polycarp (Gebhardt, *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten*, pp. 6-7), of the martyrs of Lyons (*ibid.* p. 29 *ff.*), at Cirta (*ibid.* p. 135). Sometimes, as at Smyrna when Pionius was martyred, the crowd was more or less friendly (*ibid.* p. 101).

while to enumerate a few of them. Sometimes Christianity seemed to involve interference with trade, as had been the case at Ephesus and at Philippi in St. Paul's time;[1] and Christian views as to poverty, property, and the position of slaves would certainly be unacceptable to the comfortable classes.[2] Again, Christianity interfered in many ways with family life. It separated a son from his parents, or (as we see in the *Acta* of Paul and Thekla) a girl from her betrothed, and frequently led to the entire renunciation of marriage.[3] The Christian was forced to

[1] Acts xvi. 19, xix. 27. So, in Pliny's time, the desertion of the pagan temples in Bithynia had affected the pockets of the graziers by diminishing the demand for sacrificial victims. The abandonment of luxury and ornament in dress would also affect trade; and Tertullian (*Apol.* xliii.) remarks sarcastically that Christians would naturally seem "infructuosi" in the eyes of panders, astrologers, and men of kindred trades.

[2] It is true, of course, that the early Church did not demand the liberation of slaves, and that we find Christian slave-owners in the second and third centuries; but Christians regarded slaves as brothers and sisters, entitled to a full share in the rights of Church membership. Slaves could be ordained and could become bishops; the virtue of female slaves must be respected. The Christian reverence for personality is ultimately incompatible with slavery. Cp. Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, i. 167-9; Workman, *Persecution*, 149-152. Sir W. Ramsay (*Expositor*, November 1909, p. 414) truly says that if the Church had put the rights of man before the kingdom of God in its teaching, slavery would still be universal.

[3] The entreaties and remonstrances of heathen wives or parents are a common feature in the *Acta Martyrum*, *e.g.* in the cases of Polyeuctus, Phileas, and Irenaeus of Sirmium (Mason, *Historic Martyrs*, pp. 121, 322, 349). For the story of Paul and Thekla, see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, ch. xvi., and Conybeare,

hold aloof from many kinds of social intercourse. He could not be present in the theatre, circus, or amphitheatre, still less in any heathen temples.[1] He would be exposed to grave difficulties if he served as a soldier or held any civil office,[2] or adopted the profession of a teacher.[3] Hence the Christians came to be regarded as a peculiar people

Monuments of Early Christianity, who translates the Armenian version, and agrees that the tale is founded on fact.

The difficulties raised by mixed marriages are forcibly depicted by Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem.*

[1] Among many passages which might be cited, see especially Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, chs. viii., xii.; Tertullian, *Apol.* xxxv., xxxviii., and his treatises, *De Spectaculis* and *De Idololatria*, *passim.*

[2] There were, however, always many Christians in the army, and soldier-martyrs were numerous. Even Tertullian, who absolutely condemned military service (see *De Corona Militis*, ch. xi., and *De Idol.* ch. xix.), says, "implevimus castra ipsa" (*Apol.* 37). But it must have been exceptionally difficult for a soldier to escape participation in sacrifices; and the "militia Christi" was often regarded as inconsistent with an earthly service. Cp. Harnack's interesting treatise, *Militia Christi*; Workman, *Persecution*, pp. 181-188; Mason, *Historic Martyrs*, p. 205.

For the question of civil office, see Tertullian, *Apol.* xxxviii.; *De Idol.* xvii., xviii. Yet there is evidence, *e.g.* in the *Canons of Hippolytus* and the decisions of the Council of Elvira (canon 36), that Christians did sometimes hold important civil offices (Workman, *op. cit.* p. 180; *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vi. 4. p. 82).

[3] Tertullian wished wholly to debar Christians from teaching in schools because of the necessity of teaching pagan mythology (*De Idol.* x.). On this question, as on those discussed in the preceding notes, Tertullian represents a rigorist view which did not find universal acceptance, and we must recognise that there was in the Church a divergence of view and of practice, the stricter school holding quite aloof from social and professional life, the

(τρίτον γένος),[1] unsocial and anti-social like the Jews,[2] useless to the community (*infructuosi*), or positively dangerous.[3] Their creed and worship were widely misrepresented; their sacraments were suspected of being tainted with cannibalism, incest, and horrible immorality; accusations of magic and witchcraft were by no means unknown;[4] and under the laws

majority engaging in it, but endeavouring to avoid entanglement with paganism. (See Workman, *op. cit.* 173-175, who refers to the *Canons of Hippolytus* as permitting Christians to teach.)

[1] The most notable passages occur in Tertullian, *e.g. Ad Nationes*, i. viii. "Plane, tertium genus dicimur" (the Romans being the first and the Jews—on religious grounds—the second); also *Scorpiace*, x. (of the popular clamour in the circus) "Usque quo genus tertium?" (How long are we to endure this third race?) These and other references are discussed at length by Harnack in an Excursus (*Mission and Expansion*, i. pp. 266-278).

[2] The charge of being unsocial or anti-social may be illustrated from Tertullian, *Apology*, chs. xvi., xxxi., xlii., and almost *passim*; Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, ch. viii., "latebrosa et lucifuga natio"; and Origen, *c. Celsum*, viii. 2 ἀποτειχιζόντων ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἀπορρηγνύντων ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων. Tertullian refers to the charge of uselessness, *Apol.* xlii. "infructuosi in negotiis dicimur"; and *ibid.* xliii. His refutation of this and similar charges is not always easy to reconcile with the uncompromising aloofness which he enjoins in his *De Spectaculis*, *De Idololatria*, and *De Corona Militis*, and which he sums up in *Apol.* xxxviii. "nec ulla magis res aliena quam publica."

[3] Minucius Felix, *Octavius* ix. "eruenda . . . et exsecranda consensio"; Tertullian, *Apol.* xxxv. "publici hostes." At an earlier period Tacitus had termed Christianity "exitiabilis superstitio." (Workman, *Persecution*, p. 189.)

[4] For accusations of cannibalism and incest it is sufficient to refer to Tertullian, *Apol.* chs. ii., vii., ix.; Minucius Felix, *Octavius*,

which jealously restricted the right of association their meetings for worship were illegal, or of doubtful legality.[1] Such more specific charges led up to, and were often merged in, louder accusations of atheism, anarchism, and disloyalty to the State;[2] nor were these imputations altogether devoid of

lx.; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 1. Θυέστεια δεῖπνα καὶ Οἰδιποδείους μίξεις καὶ ὅσα μήτε λαλεῖν μήτε νοεῖν θέμις ἡμῖν (in the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne); Justin, *Apol.* i. 26.

The charge of practising magic was commonly brought against Christians; cp. the Acta S. Achatii in Gebhardt, *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten*, p. 119. See Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, i. 145; Workman, *Persecution*, 126-136. The practice of exorcism lent colour to the charge.

[1] The question how far Christians came into conflict with the law as members of illegal associations (*collegia*, *hetaeriae*), is one of great difficulty. The Roman Government was very jealous of every kind of combination among its subjects, whether religious or social, and membership in a *collegium illicitum* was reckoned as *majestas*. But, apparently, there were many *collegia* which were not licensed, and the law was not rigidly administered where danger was not apprehended. There would always be a *risk* of prosecution on this charge, but positive evidence of conflict is slender. The subject is well discussed in Hardy, *Studies*, ch. ix., whose view I have followed.

[2] The charge of "atheism" was very commonly brought against martyrs; the cry "αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους" was raised at the martyrdom of Polycarp; a similar charge was evidently made at Lyons. So Tertullian speaks of the "crimen irreligiositatis," and the accusation "Deos non colitis" (*Apol.* x. and xxiv.). Harnack has collected various references from Apologists and other writers in his essay on "Der Vorwurf des Atheismus in den drei Ersten Jahrhunderten," in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N. F., xiii. 4. For the charge of disloyalty, see Tertullian, *Apol.*, *passim*, especially chs. xxviii.-xxxv.

plausibility. The specific charges which were alleged against them were generally baseless, and the calamities of the Empire were wrongly laid at their door;[1] but the fact remains that the Christian owned a different allegiance, sought after a different unity, lived in a different world of ideas, judged according to a different standard of values, and was obliged to hold aloof from many social and political claims.

Further, we find that, when he was challenged to prove his loyalty to the Empire, he could not fulfil the test which was applied. That test was the worship of the Roman Emperor. Refusal to join in the imperial *cultus* was sometimes made a definite accusation against Christians, but more often the worship of the Emperor was used as a test, as Pliny used it in Bithynia.[2] It was a test easily applied and perfectly effectual. No true Christian would comply, and anyone who complied might be acquitted forthwith of the charge of being a Christian. The Acts of the Martyrs show how largely the test was used, and the constant refusal of Christians to join in the worship emphasised their supposed disloyalty. Imperial festivals were frequently the occasions of popular outbreaks against the Christians, while the immediate occasion of the death of many of the best-known martyrs, from Polycarp

[1] Tertullian, *Apol.* xl. "si Tiberis ascendit in moenia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si caelum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim '*Christianos ad leonem.*'"

[2] Pliny, *Epist. ad Traian.* x. 96.

downwards, was their obstinate refusal to render to Caesar the worship which they held to be due to God alone.[1]

Time fails us to trace the course of the persecutions in chronological sequence, and the work has been excellently performed for those who wish to follow the story.[2] But it is important to notice that during the first and second centuries the persecutions were spasmodic, not systematic. Trajan's edict was not an edict of general proscription any more than of general toleration; Hadrian's rescript was apparently somewhat more favourable to Christianity.[3] Under the philosopher-emperor, M. Aurelius, persecutions were more frequent and more severe, and spread to the Western provinces (especially Gaul); but there was, as yet, no organised attempt at any general suppression of the new creed, and nothing amounting to a new policy.[4]

[1] For Emperor-worship in relation to Christianity, see Appendix, Note A, p. 360.

[2] See the works referred to in note 1, p. 40. M. Allard has collected a great amount of material, and treated it in an interesting way, although we have seen reason to doubt his view of the legal aspect of persecution.

[3] For Hadrian's rescript (A.D. 124), see Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, ch. xiv.; Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, iii. 476-480; Hardy, *Studies*, pp. 108, 110. All these writers agree with Mommsen in thinking the document genuine. Ramsay thinks that the rescript was intentionally vague as to whether "the Name" was a crime or not.

[4] The reign of Marcus Aurelius was a time of depression and disaster. Dr. Bigg (*Origins of Christianity*, ch. xiv.) rightly calls Marcus "one of the worst of rulers," and notes his extreme superstition. No emperor showed less power of understanding

Christianity was subject to proscription because it was recognised as dangerous in principle; but the proscription was not yet rigorously carried out, because Christianity was not yet considered to be an actual and pressing danger to the State. In the third century, when the numbers of Christians had largely increased, and the organisation of the Church had developed, when dioceses were grouped round metropolitan sees, and provincial synods were summoned,[1] there arose a greater consciousness of Catholic unity and a more developed line of

Christianity, and it is plain that during his reign Christians were sought out, and that in the persecution of Lyons he sanctioned the most barbarous torture. But there was no *general* persecution, and Tertullian (*Apol.* v.) strangely calls him "protector" rather than "debellator Christianorum."

[1] Even in the second century we find provincial synods held to consider Montanism (in Asia), and the date of Easter (at Rome, at Corinth, in Palestine, Pontus, and Gaul); and in the third century such synods became more frequent. There are records of at least five Councils at Carthage in the short episcopate of Cyprian, one of them attended by 87 bishops (Hefele, *History of Christian Councils*, book i. chs. i.-ii.). In addition to this, there was constant communication between local churches by correspondence and by travel (Allard, *Dix Leçons*, pp. 78-83). Christianity came more and more into the open, and pagans, *e.g.* Celsus, became familiar with the idea of the "Catholic Church" (cp. Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 363). For the quasi-provincial organisation of churches in the second and third centuries, see Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, i. pp. 526-7. Thus the churches of Italy were grouped round the see of Rome, Carthage was the centre for Africa, Numidia, and Mauretania, Alexandria for Egypt and Cyrenaica; but Duchesne holds that the grouping of sees according to the divisions of the imperial provinces was not earlier than Diocletian.

common action—and then the time arrived when sterner and more sweeping measures seemed to be necessary. Septimius Severus (A.D. 202) was the first to inaugurate a new procedure. With him begins a system of persecution by edict from head-quarters. He forbade all new conversions to Christianity, and instructed the magistrates to search for the newly converted, not merely to deal with those who were brought before them.[1] In A.D. 235-8 Maximin thought to crush the Church by striking at the bishops and leading clergy, and by purging his court of Christians.[2] Under Decius in 250 the Church first encountered the full fury of the storm of universal proscription. On a fixed day all suspects were ordered to present themselves at some temple, and to sacrifice to the gods and to the Emperor.[3] Seven years later Valerian hunted down the bishops and clergy, and forbade all

[1] Spartianus (*Life of Severus*, ch. xvii.) says that Severus forbade *conversions* both to Christianity and to Judaism. This refers to his earlier edict. The latter years of his reign were marked by severe persecutions in the East and in Africa (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. i.). Some of Tertullian's writings are contemporary with this persecution. See Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire romain*, ch. iii.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 28; Allard, *op. cit.* pp. 92-3; Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, i. 366.

[3] The edict of Decius has not been preserved, but there is much material for the history of the persecution in the writings of Cyprian, and it was in Africa that the persecution was especially severe. Apostasy was painfully common (Cyprian, *De Lapsis*). Some of the certificates of sacrifice have been found among the Egyptian papyri (Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhyncus Papyri*, vol. iv. p. 49).

Christian assemblies for worship and all Christian burial.[1] Finally, after a long interval, in the early years of the fourth century we come to the persecutions of Diocletian and Galerius, with the demolition of the churches, the burning of all sacred books, the deprivation of civil rights, the imprisonment of the clergy, and, last of all, the order for the infliction of the death-penalty on every Christian.[2] This was the culmination of the struggle to crush Christianity as "a State within a State," and to secure the religious unity of the Roman world even at the cost of denuding of its best elements an Empire which was literally perishing for want of men. We know how Diocletian, soon wearied of the butchery, retired to cultivate his cabbages at Salona, how Galerius was cowed by illness and death into retracting his bloodthirsty edicts, and how the whole policy of persecution was suddenly reversed by Constantine, whose motives for the change we shall consider in the succeeding lecture.

[1] A large number of bishops suffered martyrdom under Valerian, including Pope Xystus II., Cyprian, and Fructuosus, bishop of Tarragona. With the reign of Gallienus (260-268) the Church entered upon the longest period of peace that it enjoyed before Constantine (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 13). Gallienus was the first Emperor to recognise the rights of Christians in any formal edict, but apparently his action did not amount to making Christianity a *religio licita*.

[2] Accounts of the persecutions of Diocletian and Galerius are preserved in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* viii.-ix., and Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*. See also Mason's *Persecution of Diocletian*, and a good general account in Workman, *Persecution*, pp. 265-282.

Before we leave the subject of martyrdom it remains to say a word on one or two points. Were the martyrs really numerous? We have no materials for taking a census of martyrdoms. Gibbon, following Dodwell, and building on an isolated statement made by Origen before the most sanguinary persecutions had begun, argued that martyrdom was not really common, and suggested 2000 martyrs as an outside figure for the victims of the Diocletian persecution.[1] So low an estimate seems to be ridiculous; but, on the other hand, the figures given by some of the Fathers and in martyrologies are rhetorical and exaggerated.[2] The safest course is "nec omnia credere nec nihil." It must be remembered that even in the time of Diocletian Christians were only a small minority of the population of the Empire.[3] In the earlier perse-

[1] Gibbon, ed. Bury, ii. pp. 97-98, 137-138; H. Dodwell, *De paucitate Martyrum*, in *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*, 1684.

Origen, *c. Celsum*, iii. 8 ὀλίγοι κατὰ καιροὺς καὶ σφόδρα εὐαρίθμητοι ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν θεοσεβείας τεθνήκασι.

[2] Gibbon, *l.c.*, gives as an instance the story of 10,000 Christian soldiers having been put to death in one day by Trajan or Hadrian (Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ii. 82).

[3] Harnack (*Mission and Expansion*, ii. 324-333) thinks it impossible to give definite percentages for the Empire or for particular provinces, but divides the provinces into four categories. In the first category, the regions in which Christianity in A.D. 300 numbered nearly one-half of the population, he places the whole of modern Asia Minor, part of Thrace, Armenia, Cyprus, and Edessa. The higher proportion of Christians in the East is strongly marked.

The conjectures of other scholars vary so widely as to show

cutions the number of martyrs was relatively small, but in the persecutions of Decius and Diocletian there can be little doubt that tens of thousands suffered death, besides those whose punishment consisted in torture, mutilation, banishment, or loss of property.[1] We must not overlook the numerous apostasies under Decius or Diocletian—the result of previous periods of comparative security—nor idealise the spiritual standard of the average Christianity of the second and third centuries. But the evidence proves beyond doubt that the constancy which a martyr needed was not rare. It was not the attainment of bishops and presbyters only, or of a few specially saintly souls. Thousands of the rank and file of the Church rose to the martyr level; indeed, we have many instances in which martyrdom was unnecessarily courted. The martyr was not perfect; he was sometimes proud or uncharitable, and gave his body to be burned without much real love; and martyrdom was by no means free from abuse.[2] Nevertheless, the frequency of martyrdom

the impossibility of reaching any definite conclusion. Gibbon suggested one-twentieth of the total population of the Empire for the reign of Decius; Chastel one-tenth for the East and one-fifteenth for the West. Other writers have been so bold as to claim one-fifth, or even one-half, in the time of Constantine (cp. Chastel, *Destruction du paganisme*, pp. 35-36).

[1] For the number of martyrs, see Appendix, Note B, p. 362.

[2] The Church always discouraged its members from courting martyrdom (Cyprian, *Epist.* 81, ed. Hartel; *De Laps.* x.; *Martyrium Polycarpi*, ch. iv.), and forbade all insults to pagan gods and their worship (Origen, *c. Celsum*, viii. 38). By allowing flight in persecution it offended the Montanists (Tertullian, *De Fuga in*

remains as an evidence not only of the intensity of the Christian's faith, but of his loyalty to the Divine Society, and of the solidarity of the Church in the face of the World. Martyrdoms were, as we know, the cause of conversions from Paganism; Justin Martyr attributed his own conversion to this cause,[1] and Tertullian was not merely indulging in empty rhetoric when he declared that the more Christians were mown down by their persecutors the more numerous they became, and that the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church.[2] Christianity produced martyrs; paganism (when its turn came) could produce few or none.[3] History seems to teach us that persecution does not always fail to exterminate a creed. It may succeed when the religion which it attacks is strong only in numbers. It fails when the cause which it would fain crush is strong in the enthusiasm and the solidarity of its adherents, and in their consciousness of the sustaining presence of the Invisible.[4]

Persecutione, ch. x.), who, in common with some other sects, were prone to fanaticism in this matter (see Allard, *Dix Leçons*, pp. 323-327, to whom these references are mainly due).

[1] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. 12 ὁρῶν δὲ ἀφόβους πρὸς θάνατον καὶ πάντα τὰ νομιζόμενα φοβερά, ἐνενόουν ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φιληδονίᾳ ὑπάρχειν αὐτούς.

[2] Tertullian, *Apol.* ch. l. "plures efficimur quotiens metimur a vobis; semen est sanguis Christianorum"; *Id. Ad Scapulam*, ch. v.; Allard, *Dix Leçons*, x. "La Témoignage des martyrs."

[3] The resistance offered by paganism to the persecution directed against it by Christianity is described on pp. 106-107.

[4] Lecky, *History of Rationalism*, vol. ii. p. 5 (second edition): "In the great conflicts between argument and persecution the

We have been tracing the policy of the World-power towards the Church. Let us now gather up some indications of the attitude of the Church towards the world during this period of conflict. We noticed in the Apocalypse an attitude towards the World-power which we might describe in modern phrase as "intransigent." The writer asks no quarter from the persecuting State, and in the spiritual sphere he gives none. This was a departure from the position taken by St. Paul, and we do not find that it was usually maintained by the Apologists of the second century. Some of these writers, the later ones especially, are inclined to make the best of the Empire. They profess their loyalty, and acknowledge the advantages of the imperial government and the *Pax Romana*. They cannot worship the Emperor, but they will pray for him. They argue that persecution originated with the worst emperors, such as Nero and Domitian, and is not a necessary part of the imperial policy.[1] Towards the State, then, the Christian attitude is

latter has been continually triumphant. Persecution extirpated Christianity in Japan; it crushed the fair promise of the Albigenses; it rooted out every vestige of Protestantism from Spain."

Cp. Henderson, *Nero*, p. 357: "The opinion that no belief, no moral conviction, can be eradicated from a country by persecution is a grave popular fallacy."

[1] A good specimen of the profession of loyalty on the part of an apologist may be found in the quotation from Melito of Sardis, preserved in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 26; and Athenagoras (*Legatio pro Christianis*, 37) adopts the same attitude. Cp. Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire romain*, pp. 50-56.

to some extent modified, nor need we regret the change, which was a reversion to the earlier attitude of St. Paul.[1] As regards the distinctness of the Church from the World in its faith and life and standard of duty, we find no relaxation of Christian theory. Ignatius, Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius—all would be at one in maintaining the absolute independence of Christianity, and its fundamental incompatibility with any pagan creed or standard of morals. If they differ in the manner of expression, it is due rather to difference of individual temperament than to any change in the Christian theory. But theory is one thing and practice is another. We have to ask how far the high spiritual standard and the principle of distinctness from the World were maintained in practice. With our scanty records we can only make dim guesses at the relative proportion of good and indifferent, consistent and inconsistent Christians. But we may trace the operation of one or two important causes.

1. In Apostolic and sub-Apostolic times the immediate expectation of the *Parousia* exercised a far-reaching effect. If the existing World were destined to vanish utterly at an early date, if the final judgment were immediately impending, then plainly there was less temptation to be conformed to the world. The abandonment in the belief in the immediate *Parousia* had important effects upon

[1] Romans xiii. 1-7; 1 Tim. ii. 2; Titus iii. 1; cp. 1 St. Peter ii. 13-17.

the Church in several directions; it encouraged, for instance, the development of Church organisation, which the prevalence of the belief had naturally discouraged. But it was hardly possible that the belief could disappear without some weakening of the moral fibre of the Christian community.[1]

2. Another cause was operative on an increasing scale. In the first generation of Christianity every man became a Christian at his peril. The converts were adults, and each conversion represented an act of individual deliberation and resolve. A few may have misunderstood Christianity, or, like Simon Magus, may have accepted it from unworthy motives; but as a rule each individual must have counted the cost. There were as yet no hereditary and conventional Christians; even at the end of the second century Tertullian could say "fiunt, non nascuntur, Christiani."[2] But a change soon came. Infant baptism becomes the established practice, as new generations arise, and hereditary Christians are mingled in increasing proportion with those who accepted Christianity from personal conviction of its truth.[3] The effects of this inevitable change

[1] See Appendix, Note C, p. 364.

[2] Tertullian, *Apol.* ch. xviii. Already in his time the statement had largely ceased to be true.

[3] Harnack (*History of Dogma*, ii. 142-143) notes the "complete obscurity" which prevails as to the adoption of infant baptism, and believes that it became universal in the third century, although Origen speaks of it as an apostolic tradition Mr. Vernon Bartlet observes that "the striking thing about infant

would be modified and concealed so long as there was a large number of fresh converts, and the Church was still a comparatively small body with a strong *esprit de corps*, and liable to persecution; but it was bound to tell, and it did tell, even in this period.

3. During all this period Christianity was liable to persecution, and, during a large part of it, it was actually persecuted. But we saw that there were considerable periods of cessation and calm. One such period preceded the persecution of Decius; a longer one came between the persecution of Valerian and that of Diocletian.[1] These intervals of rest did not improve the spiritual life of the Church. Persecution always acted as a winnowing-fan, and separated the wheat from the chaff. In a time of persecution no one became a Christian who was not in earnest, and the nominal or half-hearted Christians who had crept in already were weeded out and denied their faith. The frequency of apostasy in the persecution of Decius proves that the period of peace had brought about a perceptible lowering of the level of discipleship. The writings of Cyprian are eloquent on this point.[2]

baptism is the slow and partial nature of its advance, as if, in its unqualified sense, it violated the older idea of salvation" (*Apostolic Age*, p. 473).

[1] The Church enjoyed immunity from persecution from 238 to 249, between Maximin and Decius; and from 261 (Edict of Gallienus) to 303 (First Edict of Diocletian). For the effects of this period of prosperity, cp. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 1.

[2] Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, chs. viii.-xi. The question of the treatment of the *lapsi* also occupies a large proportion of Cyprian's

4. A symptom closely connected with this lowering of tone, in consequence of the growth of hereditary or conventional elements, is the appearance within the Church of ascetic movements, which begin in this period, and form a still more marked feature of the succeeding age, when we encounter the rapid growth of monasticism and the full development of Donatism. In the Ante-Nicene Church the ascetic impulse found its strongest expression in Montanism, the lineal ancestor of many subsequent Puritan attempts to narrow the Catholic Church so as wholly to exclude all lax and inconsistent members from the fold, and to confine the name of Christian to those who accept and observe a rigorous discipline. The Montanists, following the example of some Gnostic sectaries, termed themselves πνευματικοί, and spoke contemptuously of Catholics as ψυχικοί. They insisted on the principle of the development, not only of discipline, but of doctrine, by means of new prophetic revelations, arguing that Christ had many things to say which the Apostles could not then bear, but which the Spirit of Truth was to reveal later. The aims and principles of Montanism are known to us with exceptional fulness owing to the adherence to that sect of the ardent but gloomy genius of Tertullian; we may mention the institution of new fasts, the absolute prohibition of second marriages, and the refusal of absolution after penance to those who

letters, and the frequency of apostasy is evident, although no numbers can be given.

were guilty of adultery or fornication. Yet, however much we may deplore the excesses of Montanism, it must be remembered that it had a nobler side. It was, in fact, a protest against the lowering of the spiritual standard and the relaxation of that stricter discipline which had characterised the Church when it was smaller in numbers and more abounding in zeal and self-sacrifice.[1] Another indication of incoming laxity, which we begin to find in this period, is the acknowledgment of a different moral standard for clergy and for laity, which accompanied the growing separation of the clerical order, but was none the less a departure from early Christian ideas.[2]

[1] The writings of Tertullian which throw most light on Montanism are his treatise *Adversus Praxeam*, his *De Anima*, and his writings on discipline, fasting, marriage, and penance (*De Pudicitia*, *De Monogamia*, *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, *De Virginibus Velandis*, *De Jejuniis*, *De Corona Militis*, etc.). For the significance of Montanism in the history of the Church, see Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ii. 94 f.; Gore, *Church and Ministry*, appended Note A; and a valuable monograph by the Rev. J. de Soyres, *Montanism and the Primitive Church* (Cambridge, 1878).

[2] See Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 164, where it is noted how in the fourth century clerical celibacy was enforced by Pope Siricius, on the assumption that "to please God" was a distinctively clerical obligation. The same tendency may be traced even before Constantine. Bishop Gore (*Church and Ministry*, ch. v. ed. i. pp. 245-246) remarks that in St. Paul's Pastoral Epistles we find "distinct offices in the Church, not different standards of living for clergy and laity." Hatch (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 136) specially connects the distinction between clerical morality and lay morality with the prevalence of infant baptism, and notes Tertullian's repudiation of this dual standard (*De Exhort. Cast.* vii.).

In view of the persistent struggle against the World and the secular power, it is natural that this period should be marked by the development and solidification of the government, institutions, and organisation of the Church. The dangers which arose from heresy also necessitated measures of self-protection. The expectation of the Second Coming had, as we have seen, at first been unfavourable to any such development. But the growth of organised government and unity during the second and third centuries is undeniable. To follow it in detail would be impossible here, and would involve us in many historical controversies and matters of vehement ecclesiastical dispute. Some general features, which are beyond dispute, suffice for our purpose.

1. There is a growing consciousness of unity, and an increase of intercommunication between different local Churches. In the last lecture we did not see any reason to admit that the local ἐκκλησίαι were in a position of unrestrained independence, or that the theory of the universal ἐκκλησία was an idea which sprang full-grown from the brain of St. Paul.[1] But undoubtedly in the two centuries after St. Paul's death the idea of an universal Church was more fully developed. It would be interesting to trace the use of the epithet "Catholic" as applied to the Church from Ignatius to Cyprian and Augustine, both in its positive sense of geographical extension and transcendence of

[1] See lecture i. p. 29, and Appendix, Note F, p. 355.

national boundaries, and in its exclusive sense as contrasting the Church with heretical or non-Christian bodies.[1] As regards organisation, no General Council of the whole Church was possible until persecution had given place to toleration and protection, but the way was prepared for a General Council by the grouping of dioceses into provinces, following, in many cases, the lines of the civil organisation, and by the holding of local Synods or provincial Councils, such as we meet with in the second and third centuries.[2] No single see was recognised as possessing authority over all sees, but we find a place of honour assigned to the bishops of such great cities as Antioch and Alexandria, and, above all, to the bishop of Rome. Historians are bound to repudiate the exaggerated claims put forward in later centuries on behalf of the Popes, and supported by notorious perversions of truth, but it must be acknowledged that the primacy of honour, which was naturally accorded to the bishop of the Imperial City even in the Ante-Nicene Church, was an influence which made for unity.[3] A striking illustration of this is found in the fact that in 272, during one of the periods of peace, when a dispute occurred about Church property in connection with the heresy of Paul of

[1] See Appendix, Note D, p. 365.

[2] See *antea*, p. 58.

[3] Some causes of the prestige and primacy of the Roman Church are traced by Harnack, *History of Dogma*, ii. 149-168. As to the Roman claims and the development of the Papacy, see lecture v. pp. 173-184.

Samosata, the Emperor Aurelian, who decided the controversy, adjudged the property to those Christians who were in communion with the bishops of Italy and the bishop of Rome. This is perhaps the earliest recognition by the secular power of the collective existence of Christians and of the Catholic idea, as it is the first instance of an appeal to the secular authority on a question of Church property.[1]

The development of the ministry of the Church during this period is noteworthy; it contributed materially to the effectiveness of its organisation. We have already noticed a growing demarcation between clergy and laity. Another most important feature is the development of what has been called the "monarchical episcopate." Whatever theory may be held as to the original relation of the episcopate to the apostles on the one hand and to the presbyters on the other, it cannot be doubted that after the Apostolic age there was a great growth in the functions and powers of the local bishops.[2] Already in the letters of Ignatius the

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 30. The significance of the incident is pointed out by Mr. A. Taylor Innes, in his most useful, but apparently little known, handbook, *Church and State* (2nd ed., pp. 16-19).

[2] Dr. Hatch's theory that the ἐπίσκοποι were originally financial officers, analogous to the ἐπίσκοποι of pagan guilds, does not appear to rest upon any adequate evidence. But the passing away of the "extraordinary ministry" of apostles and prophets would naturally increase the powers of the heads of the permanent ministry in every place. Cp. *Encyc. Bibl.*, s.v. "Bishops," a judicious article by Dr. Armitage Robinson.

bishop is regarded as the centre of unity in every local Church,[1] and increasingly throughout the next 200 years he is recognised as the chief pastor and the chief administrator and representative of each body of Christians. The bishop was naturally the first to be marked down by the secular power in times of persecution,[2] and when Gallienus (260-268) put an end to the persecution which was instituted by his predecessor Valerian, he treated with the bishops as the recognised governors of the Church.[3] Most undoubtedly the strengthening of the episcopate played an important part in the development of the Church as an organised unity in the face of a hostile world.

It would fall outside our limits to enumerate the various heresies and schisms with which the unity, and indeed the very existence, of the Church was threatened from Apostolic times onwards. They are familiar to the readers of any handbook of ecclesiastical history. But we may notice how the main body of the Church was ever alert to recognise the dangers which beset her from disunion, and the necessity of maintaining her essential

[1] Ignatius, *ad Ephes.* iv., v.; *ad Smyrn.* viii.; *ad Magnes.* vii.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 28, says that Maximin (A.D. 235) struck at τοὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντας μόνους, ὡς αἰτίους τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διδασκαλίας. Cyprian suffered as the leader of a "nefaria conspiratio" (*Mart. Cypr.* iv.), and he records in one of his letters that the Emperor Decius said he would rather hear of a rival to his throne than of a Christian bishop in Rome (*Epist.* 55, ed. Hartel).

[3] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 13.

principles, even at the cost of excluding some who professed themselves to be followers of Christ. At one time the danger came from those who professed tenets which were really Judaic or pagan rather than Christian, as was the case with some of the forms of Gnostic error; at other times the source of strife was a divergence on an important point of Church government or discipline, as in the instances of Montanism and Novatianism.[1] But in every case the ranks were closed and the unity of the Catholic Church was preserved. In some instances the error was persistent, and maintained a sporadic existence for generations,[2] but, in the end, the schismatic body always dwindled and disappeared without impairing the unity of Catholic Christianity. The dangers which threatened the Church from secular persecution never blinded her to the equally great internal dangers to which she was exposed. With the throwing off of these imperfect or erroneous elements the consciousness of Catholic unity became more clear, and the theory

[1] The real offence of Montanism was not theological error, but the attempt to insist upon a more ascetic discipline, and to found a pure Church within the visible Church. Novatianism was wholly concerned with a great question of discipline. Like Donatism later it was a protest against growing laxity.

[2] Montanism was practically dead by the time of St. Augustine, though a few traces of it may be found in the fifth and sixth centuries (de Soyres, *Montanism*, p. 54). Novatianism was vigorous in some districts for several centuries. The Theodosian code directs more than one edict against it, and it is mentioned in the 95th Canon of the Council *in Trullo*, A.D. 692 (*Dict. Christ. Biog.* iv. 58).

of unity hardened into the rigorous doctrine asserted by Cyprian in the famous words "Salus extra ecclesiam non est."[1] We may well think that Cyprian pressed his theory beyond the bounds of revealed truth or of Christian charity; but it can hardly be denied that the degree of ecclesiastical unity which such a doctrine represented was a valuable force in the great conflict in which the Church was engaged. The Church of the third century possessed at least this advantage, that she knew clearly who belonged to her ranks and who were to be reckoned as outside them.

We know that in spite of all her troubles from heresies arising within her own borders, in spite of the frequent, though intermittent, pressure of persecution from the State, and in spite of the incessant hatred of the great mass of heathen society in which she moved, the growth of the Church was rapid and continuous. She drew converts, not from one class alone, but from all classes, although throughout this period—especially during the earlier half of it—it is probable that the lower classes formed a predominant proportion of the Christian body.[2] The geographical extension of the Church at the beginning of the fourth century has been lucidly described by Harnack.[3] It would be extremely interesting if we

[1] Cyprian, *Epist.* 73 (*ed.* Hartel), and cp. *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, c. 7, "Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem."

[2] See Appendix, Note E, p. 367.

[3] Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, vol. ii.

could obtain sufficient data to form an approximate calculation as to the proportion between the number of Christians and the total population of the Empire at the time when the whole situation was changed by the publication of the Edict of Milan. But all statistics of population in the ancient world are largely guesswork, even though the guesses may be made by scholars of learning and genius. It seems certain, in any case, that the Christians formed in very few places a majority of the total population, and, taking the Empire as a whole, they were not more than a respectable minority.[1] But they were a growing minority, powerful out of all proportion to their numerical strength, and confident in the belief that the future was on their side. They knew that the sound of the Gospel had gone out into all lands and its words unto the ends of the known world, and they believed in the inherent power of the Gospel and in the mission of the Church to extend and perpetuate it. On the side of paganism there was no corresponding consciousness of strength and vitality. And, therefore, although the victory had not been completed at the time when the State laid aside its hostility, we must take into account not merely the actual total of the Christian population in the year 313, but the forces at work and the direction in which events were moving. Christianity had baffled persecution and was overcoming the Roman world. The very fact of the sudden change in imperial policy was, we shall see in the

[1] See *antea*, pp. 61, 62.

next lecture, something more than the proclamation of an individual conviction as to religious truth on the part of the new master of the Roman Empire. It was a confession that Christianity must now be recognised as the *victrix causa*. Constantine was no Cato, that he should chivalrously espouse a losing cause.

How are we to account for the victory of the Church? In one of his most celebrated chapters Gibbon adduced a number of reasons by which he accounted for the success of Christianity in the long struggle.[1] In recent days Harnack has also classified the elements of superiority in the Christian armoury.[2] Probably no two historians, secular or ecclesiastical, would estimate the different factors according to precisely the same scale. But it may be said with justice that both Gibbon and Harnack have laid too much stress upon causes which, after all, are secondary.[3] The Christian will naturally believe that Christianity succeeded because of its inherent and final truth. The neutral inquirer may at least admit that it succeeded because it supplied the religious needs of the age—needs which an outworn paganism and a dead mythology could no longer supply, even though repeated attempts had been made to reanimate them by the infusion of Platonic

[1] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xv.

[2] Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, vol. i. book ii., "Mission Preaching in Word and Deed."

[3] See Appendix, Note F, p. 368.

philosophy,[1] or of Oriental cults,[2] or by the establishment of the imperial worship as a political and religious bond for all citizens and subjects of the Empire. The Christian Church found in existence a demand for a new and vital religion. It supplied that demand, in the first place, by its distinctive doctrines, such as those of Sin and Atonement, of Resurrection and the Future Life, of the Fatherhood of God, the Incarnation of Christ, and the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit; and, hardly in less degree, by its appeal to men as a supernatural society and a Way of Life. We may well keep ever before us the warning not to idealise Ante-Nicene Christianity over much. The imperfections which we traced in the Apostolic Church were

[1] Harnack (*Mission and Expansion*, ii. 322) is inclined to regard Neoplatonism as the most dangerous opponent of the Church. The Christian Platonists had failed to effect a conciliation between Christian doctrine and Neoplatonic philosophy, and Porphyry, though professing respect for Christ, deliberately attacked Christianity. This anti-Christian tradition continued among his successors and powerfully influenced the Emperor Julian.

[2] The extent to which the old Greco-Roman polytheism had been orientalised before the time of Constantine is clearly brought out in F. Cumont's *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (Paris, 1909). See p. 303, "L'ancien culte national de Rome est mort. . . . Les cultes encore vivants, contre lesquels se porte l'effort de la polémique chrétienne, qui se fait plus amère lorsqu'il parle d'eux, sont ceux de l'Orient." Of all Oriental religions the worship of Mithra reached the highest moral elevation, and was the most formidable rival of Christianity (*id. ibid.* p. 236; and cp. his great work, *Les Mystères de Mithra*).

always there, and, with the spread of the Church, love, as we have seen, was more apt to grow cold, and faction to become schism, and weakness apostasy.[1] But when all this has been said, the truth remains that the Church formed a great Divine Society such as the world had never seen before —a Society catholic, cosmopolitan, independent of civil and national systems and organisations, open to every race and every rank. It was a Society from which unworthy members could not indeed be wholly excluded, as the Montanist and the Donatist imagined in their zeal, but one in which brotherliness and humanity, reverence and enthusiasm were the rule and not the exception. Despite the failures and inconsistencies of individual members in every generation, and the undoubted lowering of tone in the third century, the Church of the Ante-Nicene age never took the step of deliberately conforming herself to the World, or of abandoning the primary principles of corporate distinctness and of individual sacrifice laid down by her Master. She was, in the main, content to be reckoned among the weak and the foolish things of the World, and she faithfully endeavoured to distinguish between the civic obedience and loyalty due to the

[1] One of the most striking evidences of the degeneration of Christianity before the time of Constantine is supplied by the canons of the Synod of Elvira (Iliberis) in Spain (A.D. 305-6). Cp. A. W. W. Dale, *The Synod of Elvira*. The canons (given in Hefele, *Hist. of Christian Councils*, i. 138 f.) show a very low state of sexual morality (canons 12-14, 30, 31, 63-72), and a prevalent tendency to relapse into idolatry (canons 1-4, 40, 41).

Caesars and the higher spiritual allegiance which could be claimed by God alone. She did not stoop even in the hope of conquest, but was content to win the victory by her strong faith, her fidelity to principle, her unbroken unity, and her *esprit de corps*. How far she remained true in days of greater outward prosperity to the principles which guided her in the age of adversity and persecution we must inquire hereafter.

In a period which covers some seven generations, and with a Church that embraced members of such widely different stages of development and natural tendency, it would be impossible to give a complete picture of the religious characteristics of Christianity in the words of any single writer. There is, however, preserved to us, in an anonymous writing of the later part of the second century —the *Epistle to Diognetus*—a singularly beautiful passage, which seems to me to set forth what was the *ideal* with regard to the World, an ideal which was not seldom translated into action, and inspired many of the best lives. I quote it in an abbreviated form.

"Christians," writes the unknown author, "dwell in their native cities, yet as sojourners: they share in everything as citizens, and endure all things as aliens: every foreign country is to them a fatherland, and every fatherland a foreign soil. . . . They live in the flesh, but not according to the flesh. They pass their time on earth, but exercise their citizenship in heaven. They obey the enacted laws, and by their private lives they overcome the

laws. They love all men, and are persecuted of all men. They are unknown, and yet condemned; they are put to death, and yet raised to life. They are beggars, and yet make many rich; they lack all things, and yet abound in all things. . . . In a word, what the soul is in the body, that are Christians in the World. The soul is diffused throughout the limbs of the body; so are the Christians through the cities of the World. The soul dwells in the body and is not of the body: so Christians dwell in the world and are not of the World. The flesh hates the soul and wars against it, though it suffers no wrong, because it is hindered by it in its pleasures: even so the World hates the Christians, though it is not wronged by them, because they range themselves against its pleasures. The soul loves the flesh which hates it; so do Christians love those that hate them. The soul is shut up in the body, and yet holds the body together; so Christians are shut up in the World as in a prison, and yet it is they who hold the World together. . . . The soul is improved by being denied indulgence in food and drink; so Christians abound more and more under chastisement. Such is the high post which God has assigned to them, and from which it is not lawful for them to excuse themselves."[1]

Not by compromise, then, not by asking little,

[1] *Ep. to Diognetus*, chs. 5-6. The passage which I have quoted is disparaged as unreal and rhetorical by Harnack (*Mission and Expansion*, i. 253) and Workman (*Persecution*, p. 169). When I selected it as typical, it had escaped my memory that it is so quoted in Newman's *Grammar of Assent*; and in Bishop

but by claiming the whole sphere of human life did Christianity win its victory. The cross was not worn as an ornament; it was no empty symbol. "The old Gnostics," says Dr. Bigg, "called the cross '*Horos*,' the Boundary or Dividing Line. The Gnostics were a curious people, but they were right here."[1] To the heathen Christianity seemed, no doubt, a joyless creed, a life not worth living; but the Christian literature of the second and third centuries gives us no picture of gloom or melancholy. The Christian disciple found freedom in service, joy in inward peace, enthusiasm in the love of Christ. It is the verification in experience of St. Paul's paradox, "dying and behold we live," of Christ's paradox of losing the soul and finding it—of the eternal paradox that renunciation is the first condition of all true and more abundant life—

> "Each soul bent nobly on unselfish striving
> To win perfection, each aim raised above
> Earth's low horizon, every joy deriving
> From joy's pure source—all these a ladder prove
> From changing life up to unchanging love.
> Unchanging love! and this is death's negation—
> Ah! pure and radiant souls, from earth withdrawn!
> Ye are our surety, and our emulation;
> Thus torch lights torch to furthest generation,
> Eternal fires of truth that presage dawn."

Westcott's (posthumous) work, *The Two Empires* (which has appeared since these lectures were delivered), it is regarded in the same light. Bishop Westcott apparently dated the letter in the reign of Hadrian (p. 93).

[1] Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, Preface, p. xv.

LECTURE III

THE CHURCH SECULARISED BY THE WORLD —CONSTANTINE TO JUSTINIAN

Et dubitamus adhuc Romam tibi, Christe, dicatam
In leges transisse tuas ?

PRUDENTIUS, *Contra Symmachum*, i. 588.

III

THE CHURCH SECULARISED BY THE WORLD —CONSTANTINE TO JUSTINIAN

St. Mark ix. 50: "Salt is good: but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another."

About the close of the second century Tertullian had remarked the impossibility of a Roman emperor becoming a Christian.[1] Within 125 years the seeming impossibility was accomplished, and it will be the first part of our inquiry in this lecture to consider what manner of man he was who accomplished it.

The Emperor Constantine is one of the few men to whom the universal verdict of history has accorded the title of Great; and if greatness is to be reckoned by the influence which a man exercises upon the course of the world's affairs, and the changes which he brings about in the lives and destinies of men, rather than by genius, the fitness of the epithet cannot be disputed. Few men, if any, have ever been the instruments of so vast a change; and Constantine was not a passive instru-

[1] Tertullian, *Apol.* ch. xxxi.

ment. In his later years, at all events, he believed himself to be the viceroy chosen to execute the Divine will. For good or for evil, his task was executed with zeal and fervour, and the impress of his own vigorous, though limited, personality was stamped upon the varied acts of a long reign.

What judgment are we to pass upon the character and motives of Constantine? The question is one of exceptional difficulty. It was inevitable that Constantine's memory should be bitterly assailed by pagan writers, and that it should be as extravagantly praised by Christians. If we were to follow Fleury's advice, and only give credence to everything bad which is told of Constantine by Eusebius, and everything good which is asserted by Zosimus, the resulting portrait would be almost a blank.[1] Hardly any crime was too dark for Zosimus to impute to the Emperor. Eusebius, whom Dean Stanley called Constantine's chaplain, confessor, and imperial clerk of the closet, wrote his biography immediately after his death; but whatever merits Eusebius possessed as a historian—and they are by

[1] Fleury, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, ii. 60 "Enfin, on ne se trompera point sur Constantin, en croyant le mal qu'en dit Eusèbe, et le bien qu'en dit Zosime." Cp. Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, ii. chs. 28-39. Zosimus imputes perjury, impiety, boastfulness, luxurious and unwarlike character, besides the murder of Crispus and Fausta and of a second wife. He attributes Constantine's conversion to Christianity to his belief that he could thus wipe out the guilt of his murders (ch. 29), but this account is impossible, if only on chronological grounds. For the murders themselves there is evidence independent of Zosimus.

no means slight—his critical faculty deserted him in describing his hero (for Constantine was a hero to his chaplain), and his account of Constantine is little better than a nauseous panegyric, sometimes bordering upon blasphemy.[1] Its value lies in the documents which it preserves, and in the record of scenes in which Eusebius himself took part. But the writer is absolutely silent as to crimes of which it is probable that Constantine was guilty—the murder, for instance, of his wife Fausta and his son Crispus within a few years after the Council of Nicaea; and for an estimate of Constantine's character, religious convictions, and policy, we must look elsewhere—we must look to the language of Constantine's own letters and edicts and lay-sermons, and to the legislative measures which he undoubtedly carried into effect.[2]

[1] Eusebius, *De Laudibus Constantini*, chs. 5, 11, 18 and *passim*. Thus in ch. 18 he speaks of the Emperor as the constant recipient of special divine inspiration—ὃς αὐτῇ τῇ πείρᾳ τῆς σωτηρίου θεότητος συναίσθησιν πολλάκις εἰληφώς, οὐ λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἔργοις αὐτοῖς, κήρυξ ἅπασι τῆς ἀληθείας καθέστηκας,—and of μυρίας ἐπιφανείας, μυρίας καθ' ὕπνους παρουσίας. Cp. also many passages in the *De Vita Constantini*, e.g. i. chs. 2, 4, 9, 10; iv. 1, 74, 75. Yet in the same work (iv. 48) Eusebius records that Constantine disliked flattery.

[2] It is not surprising that modern, as well as ancient, writers, should differ widely in their estimates of Constantine's character and religious sincerity. Burckhardt (*Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen*, 2nd ed., 1880) went too far in regarding his patronage of Christianity as insincere and merely political, and his character as irreligious (Abschnitt ix. p. 347 f.). A brilliant sketch of Constantine will be found in Dean Stanley's *Eastern Church*

The first impression which a study of Constantine's extant writings makes upon the mind is the extreme vagueness of his theology. "*Providentia*" —"*Divinitas*"—"*Divinum Numen*,"—such phrases are common; but even the mention of the name of Christ is comparatively rare, and reminiscences of Gospel language or Gospel incidents are seldom found.[1] There is much anxiety for the welfare of

(lect. vi.), and a discriminating estimate of his aims and work in Boissier, *Fin du paganisme*, i. Bishop Westcott's posthumous lectures on *The Two Empires* appeared after the estimate expressed in the text had been formed; I am glad to find that his view of Constantine's religious character, though perhaps more favourable than mine, is not materially different. His chapters on Constantine's reign are most valuable. I am also under great obligations to the learned article on Constantine by Bishop J. Wordsworth in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

[1] The evidence of the extant letters of Constantine is instructive on this point. The following expressions may be found in them, some of them very frequently:—*Divinitas*; *Summa Divinitas* (both very frequently); *Divinitas Summi Dei*; *Divina Providentia*; *Providentia Dei optimi maximi*; *Summa Dei Majestas*; *Divina Majestas*; *Summus Deus* (very frequently); *Divinum Numen*; *Sanctissimum Numen*. Only in six letters, I believe, and those chiefly in the later years of his reign, is there any specific mention of "Christ" or of the Saviour (*Servator*, *Salvator*). The same feature is observable in the *Lex de Pietate* and the *Edictum ad Provinciales*. It is only in the highly rhetorical *Oratio ad Sanctorum Coetum* (which Harnack strangely describes as "perhaps the most impressive apology ever written") that we find any considerable number of references to Christ or allusions to facts in His life on earth (see especially chs. 11 and 14), and these are embedded in semi-philosophical disquisition, "tinged with Neoplatonism."

In his letter to Alexander and Arius (Eusebius, *Vita Const.*

the Church, but very little appreciation of her Master's character: nine-tenths of the language might have been used by any philosophical monotheist of the day. A second point which we notice is that Constantine regards God as pre-eminently "a God who giveth victory in the battle." He attributes his victories and successes to the Labarum, and exults in the defeats and temporal reverses of his enemies, who rejected the true God. If his conception does not sink so low as that of the old Roman driving a bargain with his gods, it may certainly be said to be on the level of the Old Testament rather than of the New—it reminds us of the Deuteronomic connection of piety with temporal prosperity.[1] These two characteristics may give us a partial clue to the secret of Constantine's

ii. 65), Constantine describes the first motive of all his actions thus: "primum quidem omnium gentium inolitam de Deo opinionem in unam quasi habitudinem ac formam compingere propositum fuit." Before he espoused the cause of the Church his ideal was religious unity on the basis of monotheism; afterwards he strove to secure unity inside the Church (*e.g.* he rebukes Arius and Alexander for contending "de rebus parvis atque levissimis"), and the "undenominational" prayer which he caused to be recited by all non-Christian soldiers shows his anxiety to secure some common religious observance from those who remained outside (Eusebius, *Vita Const.* iv. 19-20). Cp. Westcott, *The Two Empires*, pp. 210-211.

[1] The following are a few among many passages in which we find Constantine connecting success in battle, or general prosperity, with his acceptance of the Cross as his standard:—Euseb. *Vita Const.* i. 31, ii. 55; *Hist. Eccl.* x. 7; *De Laud. Const.* 9; *Ad Sanct. Coet.* 22, 26.

conversion, about which many baseless theories have been woven. It is a mistake to impute to Constantine the religious views of Machiavelli or Napoleon, or to suppose that he regarded all religions as "equally false and equally useful." His father, though not actually a Christian, was a monotheist well disposed to Christianity; when his mother became a Christian is uncertain.[1] Constantine himself grew up well disposed to Christianity. From the first, probably, he disbelieved the old polytheism. Like his father Constantius, he may have viewed the persecution of Diocletian with disgust, and watched its failure with satisfaction.[2] He found himself in opposition to Maxentius, who left no stone unturned to secure the favour of all the pagan deities. Before the crisis of his fate, the battle of the Milvian Bridge, he saw, or thought he saw—for there is no reason to impugn the sincerity of his belief—the famous vision.[3] In

[1] For the religion of Constantius, cp. Euseb. *Vita Const.* i. 13-17, 27; ii. 50; and for his reluctance to join in persecution, *id.*, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 13 τοῦ τε καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου μηδαμῶς ἐπικοινωνήσας; Lactantius, *De Mort. Persecut.* 15. He welcomed Christians at his court, and is described by one writer as Χριστιανόφρων, but it is an error to suppose him to have actually professed Christianity. Constantine's mother, Helena, is also sometimes represented to have been a Christian by birth or education, but it is implied by Eusebius (*Vita Const.* iii. 47) that her conversion was due to Constantine.

[2] Constantine, *Ad Sanct. Coet.* 25; *Edict. ad Provinciales*, 4, 5; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 13.

[3] Eusebius, *Vita Const.* i. 28-31; Lactantius, *De Mort. Persecut.* 44. Eusebius declares that he derived his narrative from Con-

the support of the God of the Christians he discerned his best chance of success. It was not that the Christians were as yet a majority of the population of the Empire, or anything approaching to it. But they were an active and increasing minority; the attempts to exterminate them had failed; several of their worst enemies had come to an evil end.[1] At all events Constantine determined to make his venture of faith, and the issue of the battle gave him the kind of proof which made the strongest appeal to his mind. We may speculate as to the effect upon his religious opinions if the day had gone differently. But the victory was decisive, and Constantine's attitude to Christianity was henceforth one of growing favour. We know that he was only baptised upon his deathbed. Probably he never attained to any deep understanding of Christian doctrine, but there is no evidence that he was either sceptical or indifferent. His private life, though highly moral compared to that of most of his predecessors, was stained by some grave crimes, and was far removed from any saintly ideal. But if Constantine was neither theologian nor saint, he

stantine himself, who confirmed it with an oath. For a comparison of these two accounts, and for the absence of details in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ix. 9, see Boissier, *Fin du paganisme*, p. 27 f.

[1] For the number of Christians see *antea*, pp. 61, 76. Eusebius (*Vita Const.* 27) considers that Constantine's choice of Christianity was influenced by the reflection that idolatrous emperors had come to an evil end; and in his *Oratio ad Sanct. Coet.* (23-25) Constantine dwells on the fate of Decius, Valerian, Aurelian, and Diocletian.

was capable of ardent devotion to a cause, and throughout his reign he never wavered in his devotion to what he believed to be the cause of Christianity and of the Catholic Church. It is not too much to say that his interests became predominantly ecclesiastical. He delighted in sending advice or injunctions to bishops, whom he made his companions and favourites; he promoted the privileges and material prosperity of the Church by a long series of legislative acts.[1] In all this he proclaimed himself the minister of God.[2] The reign of Constantine constitutes the introductory chapter in what we may call the "establishment" of Christianity under the protection and favour of the civil power. But the process was lengthy and complex, and continued long after Constantine's death. Measures are sometimes loosely attributed to him which were really the work of his successors. It is important that we should distinguish different stages in the establishment of Christianity and in the depression and final suppression of its rival, the old Greco-Roman paganism.

[1] A large proportion of Constantine's extant correspondence is addressed to Eusebius or other bishops. For his intimacy with bishops from all parts, cp. Eusebius, *Vita Const.* iii. 1, 15, 16.

[2] *Lex de Pietate* (Migne, *P. L.* viii. col. 257): "Revera enim Deus ministerium meum tanquam idoneum ad voluntatem suam implendam expetiit, nostraque opera uti decrevit." Constantine no doubt regarded himself as having received a special Divine commission, but at the same time his attitude towards the Church was influenced by the relation of his pagan predecessors towards the religion of the State (cp. Westcott, *The Two Empires*, p. 225).

Our starting-point is the Edict of Milan, the text of which has been preserved to us. The professed principle of that Edict is universal toleration of *all* religious belief and worship, not on the ground of any "natural right" to freedom of conscience, but in order to allow every facility for winning the favours of Heaven.[1] Christianity was thus put on terms of nominal equality with paganism and Judaism, and a definite break was made with the religious policy which had hitherto guided the Empire, and with the whole system of national religion. Yet that system was too deeply rooted in the social and political life of the Roman State for the divorce to be completed at one blow. Constantine himself remained through life *Pontifex Maximus*, and was acclaimed as *Divus* after his death.[2] After

[1] The Edict of Milan, as issued by Constantine, is preserved in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* x. 5, and the corresponding Edict of Licinius in Lactantius, *De Mort. Persecut.* 48. Universal liberty of worship is laid down in the following terms:—"Ut daremus et Christianis et omnibus liberam potestatem sequendi religionem quam quisque voluisset; quo quidem Divinitas in sede caelesti nobis atque omnibus, qui sub potestate nostra sunt constituti, placata ac propitia possit existere." After this follow specific directions for restoration of the buildings and property of Christian congregations. The vagueness of the references to the Deity (*numen*, *Divinitas in sede caelesti*) agrees with the inscription on the arch of Constantine ("instinctu divinitatis") and with the expressions preserved in his writings. The words were meant to be capable of different interpretations by pagans and by Christians.

[2] No emperor before Gratian refused the office of *Pontifex Maximus* (Beugnot, *Destruction du paganisme*, p. 329). For Constantine's apotheosis, which is mentioned by a pagan writer,

313 the first aim of his legislation was to secure toleration and equal privileges for Christians. The clergy were exempted (like pagan priests) from State burdens and municipal duties. The Church was allowed to receive bequests and gifts. Jews were forbidden to interfere with Christian converts; pagans were forbidden to force them to take part in heathen festivals. Sunday was set apart as a day of rest, free from legal business; bishops were allowed to hold their own courts, and to have their decrees enforced by the secular power. Other enactments aimed rather at humanising or moralising Roman law in accordance with Christian principles; such were the abolition of crucifixion and of the branding of criminals on the face, the relaxation of laws against celibacy, and the measures directed against unchastity and the exposure of infants. With regard to paganism, we find that, even before he became sole ruler of the Empire, Constantine had begun to discourage it and to circumscribe its liberties. Private consultation of the *haruspices* and the offering of sacrifices in private houses were forbidden; the abuse of magic was threatened with severe penalties; the pagan emblems were removed from the imperial coins. After the defeat of Licinius, Constantine, although he renewed his

Eutropius, with the strange comment "inter divos *meruit* referri," cp. Beugnot, *op. cit.* pp. 109-110. As regards emblems on coins subsequent to 313, some pagan types are found, *e.g.* the figure of the Sun-god, with the inscription "*Soli invicto Comiti*" (Burckhardt, *op. cit.* p. 349).

expressions of zeal for religious liberty, no longer even professed an official neutrality. He spoke of heathen temples as "temples of falsehood," he forbade pagan magistrates in the East to offer public sacrifices; he suppressed the temples in which immoral worships were celebrated; he ordered that no new idols should be set up; and he bestowed special honours upon cities which were converted wholesale to Christianity. It is probably untrue to assert, as Christian writers were fond of asserting, that he closed temples and forbade sacrifices indiscriminately; it is certain that he began to restrict and discourage pagan worship, and that he openly cast the powerful argument of imperial favour into the scale of Christianity.[1] The profession of

[1] The legislation of Constantine and his immediate successors in relation to Christianity and paganism is contained in the *Codex Theodosianus*, especially book xvi., which is devoted to ecclesiastical legislation (see especially Tit. ii. "De episcopis, ecclesiis et clericis," and Tit. x. "De paganis, sacrificiis et templis"). A concise chronological conspectus of the whole course of ecclesiastical legislation from Constantine to Justinian would be extremely valuable, but I have not had leisure to attempt it. Useful accounts of the legislation of the various emperors may be found in the works of Beugnot and Chastel on the destruction of paganism in the Western and in the Eastern Empires, to which frequent references are made in the notes; and the legislative acts of Constantine, many of which are recorded by Eusebius, are collected in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* vol. viii. For Constantine's legislation see Chastel, *Destruction du paganisme*, p. 60 f.; Beugnot, *Destruction*, i. p. 99 f. For that of the period between Constantine and Theodosius, cp. Chastel, pp. 77 f., 153 f.; Beugnot, i. 137 f., 243 f., 321 f. Beugnot appears to exaggerate Constantine's "neutrality" towards paganism.

piety became a passport to his patronage; courtiers listened—gladly or otherwise—to imperial sermons. He was munificent in building churches and bestowing endowments.[1] His new capital on the Bosphorus was to be a Christian city, free from the taint of pagan traditions; he planned his own tomb amidst the cenotaphs of the Apostles.[2] His appetite for intervention in ecclesiastical affairs increased with exercise, and his earlier phase of universal toleration gave place more and more to the "external episcopate,"[3] which he used in order to discourage paganism outside the Catholic Church, while he also laboured to secure unity within. To the effects of this imperial patronage we shall return later.

The sons of Constantine acted with less caution than their father. Four years after his death Constans and Constantius issued the terse enactment "cesset superstitio: sacrificiorum aboleatur

[1] Eusebius, *Vita Const.* iii. 50; *De Laudibus Const.* 9; Constantine, *Epist. ad Caecilianum* (Migne, *P.L.* viii. 481).

[2] No pagan temple or worship was allowed in Constantinople. Eusebius, *Vita Const.* iii. 48 *τὴν αὐτοῦ πόλιν τῷ τῶν μαρτύρων καθιέρου Θεῷ.* Eusebius also describes (*Vita Const.* iv. 58-60) the *μαρτύριον* of the Apostles in which Constantine placed his own tomb. The Eastern Church conferred on him, after his death, the title of *ἰσαπόστολος*, but he was never canonised by the Western Church.

[3] Eusebius (*Vita Const.* iv. 24) records that he heard Constantine say to a company of bishops "*ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ Θεοῦ καθεσταμένος, ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην*," and adds that in accordance with this principle the Emperor exercised religious supervision (*ἐπεσκόπει*) over all his subjects, and urged them to embrace the true religion.

insania," a step which called forth loud encomiums from the Christian writer Firmicus Maternus.[1] Twelve years later Constantius, now sole ruler, ordered all temples to be closed forthwith, and threatened the penalty of the sword against all who continued to sacrifice to the gods; this was followed in 356 by a still more severe edict. There is evidence, however, that these laws were not by any means universally carried out. Especially was this the case in the city of Rome; indeed Constantius himself, after issuing these edicts, visited Rome, admired the temples, granted the usual subsidies, and nominated priests. No case is known at this time in which persistence in pagan worship was punished with death, and the execution of the law was probably left to depend upon the state of public opinion in each locality.[2]

The brief pagan reaction under the Emperor Julian presents many features of extreme interest, but we must not be tempted to dwell on those which are outside our proper limits. There are a few points, however, of which we must take account. Julian was an enthusiast for paganism—not indeed for the old Roman paganism, but for a remodelled, eclectic, philosophical Hellenistic paganism of his own.[3] His hatred of Christianity was accentuated

[1] *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 10, 2; Firmicus Maternus, *De errore profanarum religionum*, ch. 20. Cp. Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire romain*, p. 185.

[2] For legislation affecting Christianity and paganism under Constans and Constantius, see p. 95, Note 1.

[3] For the character and aims of Julian, cp. Boissier, *Fin du*

by his unfortunate experience of its least worthy side, by the enforced and hypocritical conformity of his youth, and by his contempt for the bitter quarrels of Catholics and Arians. Yet though Julian hated Christianity as a system of belief and a way of life, he was himself profoundly influenced by it. Nothing in his career is more remarkable than his attempt to remodel paganism on the lines of the Christian Church—his adoption of a quasi-monotheistic creed, his imitation of the Catholic hierarchy and organisation, his insistence that pagan priests should both practise and preach a high morality, and his eagerness that pagans should follow the example of Christian philanthropy in providing hospitals and doing works of charity.[1] He professed to allow freedom of conscience and to refrain from persecu-

paganisme, i. p. 101 f.; G. H. Rendall, *The Emperor Julian* (1879). There can be no reasonable doubt that Julian's action was due to conviction and not to political calculations. The repulsive way in which Christianity was presented to him in his youth is well shown by Rendall, p. 42 f.

Julian was an orientalised Greek, indifferent to Rome and Roman ideas. His mind was saturated with Greek literature and philosophy, and he speaks of paganism as "Hellenism." He had outgrown the old legends, but he tried to explain them away and to moralise them, blending them with Neoplatonism and merging them in a monotheistic sun-worship. But he never worked out any consistent system, and he remained superstitious to the last.

[1] Julian's letters (especially *Epist.* 49, 62, 63, ed. Hertlein) give evidence of his wish to reorganise the pagan priesthood somewhat after the model of the Catholic Church, and to require from the priests an example of morality, devotion to the care of the poor and the sick, and systematic instruction of the people in religion.

tion; but as Constantine had thrown the weight of imperial favour into one scale, so Julian threw it into the other. The favours lavished by Constantine upon bishops were now transferred to heathen philosophers and rhetoricians. Christian endowments and privileges were taken away. Soldiers were obliged to sacrifice. Christian magistrates were deprived of office. Christians were compelled to rebuild the temples which they had destroyed. In some cases they were fined or had their property confiscated, while the Government turned a blind eye to the excesses of heathen mobs, and the Emperor remarked sarcastically that in suffering violence Christians would only be fulfilling their Master's injunctions. Thus, although Julian never persecuted after the manner of Decius or Galerius, he found many methods of depressing Christianity and restoring paganism, of which none perhaps was more keenly felt than his laws about education, by which he excluded Christians from the profession of teaching.[1] We need not be surprised if we find

The involuntary homage paid to Christianity in these most interesting letters is extremely striking. Gregory Nazianzen (*Oratio* iv. chs. 111, 112) sneers at Julian's proposals as πιθήκων μιμήματα—a senseless mimicking of Christianity.

[1] For further details of Julian's treatment of Christianity, see Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire romain*, p. 209 f. Julian was so far true to his promise of tolerance (*Ep.* 43) that he did not destroy churches or enforce sacrifice, but he carried out thoroughly his declared policy of preference for pagans (*Ep.* 70). The indignation felt at his edict against Christian teachers is expressed by Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* iv. 100-102, and the pagan Ammianus

that instances of apostasy were by no means rare. For the last half century there had been in the Christian body some who were only pagans in disguise, and others who were purely indifferent. In the story of Ecebolius, the sophist, Socrates gives us the picture of a primitive "Vicar of Bray," who conformed under Constantius, apostatised under Julian, and repented of his apostasy at Jovian's accession, applying to himself the very words of my text, and abjectly asking to be trampled under foot as "salt which had lost its saltness."[1] On the other hand we have evidence of faithful resistance in many quarters, and of the salutary effect of persecution in healing internal divisions and in bracing faith and attracting fresh converts.[2] We can but speculate as to what the effect might have been had Julian

strongly disapproved of it (xxii. 10). Jerome aptly terms Julian's policy "blanda persecutio, inliciens magis quam impellens ad sacrificandum."

[1] For the story of Ecebolius, see Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 13. M. Boissier (*Fin du paganisme*, i. p. 160) cites the instance of Pegasus, Bishop of Ilion, who apostatised, but we do not find many instances of other prominent Christians forsaking their faith, and in his letters (*Epp.* 4 and 27) Julian depreciates both the quantity and the quality of his converts; in the army they were naturally more numerous.

[2] Chastel, *Destruction du paganisme*, p. 141 f., collects instances of Christians suffering death or injury from the violence of pagan mobs. Many more must have been deprived of office, or have suffered pecuniarily. For the bracing and unifying effect of persecution, see Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio* iv. 65; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 4 (quoted by Allard, *op. cit.* p. 234). Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 15) narrates a story of three Phrygians who courted martyrdom by destroying idols.

reigned for twenty years instead of for two. As it was, his ill-starred expedition against Persia brought the fulfilment of Athanasius' confident prophecy that "the little cloud would soon pass."[1] And when it passed, it left but slight traces. The pagan reaction had been too much the work of a single isolated man, too artificial, to produce any serious effect. At the accession of Jovian, the *status quo* was restored with one stroke.[2]

We must pass lightly over the reigns which form the transition from the pagan revival under Julian to the final crisis under Theodosius. Of all the rulers of the fourth century Valentinian came nearest to the realisation of a neutral and impartial policy. Himself an earnest Christian, he reversed Julian's anti-Christian legislation, but he refused to interfere with the internal affairs of the Church, and he made no attack on paganism. His extreme fairness won full recognition from the pagan historian Ammianus, but was not always appreciated by the champions of Christianity.[3] In the East Valens

[1] Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 15 *θαρρεῖτε, ἔφη, νεφύδριον γάρ ἐστι καὶ θᾶττον παρελεύσεται.*

[2] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 22-26. Jovian, when saluted as Caesar, declined on the ground that he was a Christian, whereupon the soldiers, with one voice, answered that they also were Christians.

[3] Allard (*op. cit.* p. 237 f.) gives an excellent summary of Valentinian's measures and policy. There is no reason for suspecting the sincerity of his Christianity, which he had professed in Julian's reign. He prided himself on his impartiality, and although St. Ambrose (*Epist.* 18, Migne, *P.L.* xvi. 1017) took exception to the law by which he forbade clerics to receive legacies from women,

pursued a somewhat different policy. He, too, left freedom of worship to the adherents of the old religion, but his zeal for Arian doctrines made him a bitter persecutor of the Catholic party, and in his reign Alexandria witnessed the indecent spectacle of a pagan prefect and pagan soldiers being employed to expel the successor of Athanasius and to persecute his orthodox followers. Such a sight provoked the indignant remonstrance of a fair-minded pagan writer like Themistius.[1] With the name of the youthful Emperor Gratian three bold and decisive acts are connected. He was the first Emperor in the West who refused the title and insignia of *Pontifex Maximus* as unbecoming to a Christian, and he ordered the removal of the celebrated statue of Victory, which Christians and pagans alike agreed in regarding as the symbol of official paganism, from the Senate-house in Rome. This open rupture of the relations between the old religion and the civil power was followed by the suppression of what yet remained of the Roman "Budget of Public Worship"—the allowances made by the State for certain temples and ceremonies in the capital.[2]

his fairness is praised alike by Ammianus and by the ecclesiastical historians, Socrates and Sozomen. Ammianus Marcellinus (xxx. 9) is particularly emphatic, "inclaruit quod inter religionum diversitates medius stetit, nec quemquam inquietavit."

[1] Themistius, *Oratio* xii., *ad Valentem de Religionibus;* Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* iv. 16, 17, 32; Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* xxv. 9, xliii. 30.

[2] Gratian acted with the vigour of extreme youth, and his policy of withdrawing State support and official status from paganism was probably inspired by St. Ambrose. The removal of

Theodosius, who became Emperor of the East in 379, and master of the whole Roman world a few years later, set before himself a comprehensive and clear-cut policy—nothing less than the extirpation both of paganism outside the Church and of heresy within it—and lost no time in proceeding to carry it out. His proclamation *De Fide Catholica* is one of the most important legal documents in the annals of the Christian Church. It declares the imperial will that all nations and peoples in the Empire shall follow the religion which the Apostle Peter introduced in Rome, and "which the Pontiff Damasus and the Bishop of Alexandria now profess." Those who embrace this orthodox belief in the Trinity are authorised to assume the name of Catholic Christians; all others are to be branded as infamous heretics, and their assemblies are not to be termed "Churches." They must expect not only the divine vengeance, but also punishment by imperial authority as representing the will of Heaven.[1] This establishment of internal unity under extreme penalties was followed by the long series of ecclesiastical laws for the safeguarding of the Nicene faith

the statue of Victory was regarded with dismay by the pagan senators, and was the occasion of an animated controversy between St. Ambrose and Symmachus. Cp. Symmachus, *Relatio;* St. Ambrose, *Epist.* 17, 18 (Migne). The incident is discussed at length by Boissier, *Fin du paganisme*, i. 293-338. Gratian's refusal of the insignia of Pontifex Maximus is distinctly asserted by Zosimus (iv. 36), but has been doubted by some modern writers on insufficient grounds.

[1] *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 1, 2.

and the punishment of various forms of heresy, which form no inconsiderable portion of the *Codex Theodosianus*. Other laws were also passed which secured the better observance of Sundays and festivals, forbade intermarriage with Jews, and promoted a more Christian standard of morality. In dealing with paganism Theodosius did not begin with so sweeping an edict. But his policy of harassing and circumscribing pagan worship was continuously carried out. His first step was to prohibit magic and nocturnal sacrifices; then he forbade the *haruspices* to inspect the entrails of victims. In 391 he prohibited all entrance into the temples, and followed up this measure by confiscating certain temple buildings, which were either destroyed, like the famous Serapeum of Alexandria, or converted into Christian churches. Finally, in 392 he dealt a further blow by prohibiting even private worship: all libations, incense, and every kind of offering to Lares, Penates, Genius, or family deities were rendered illegal.[1]

After the action of Theodosius in making pagan worship illegal, there still remained a few measures by which his successors might complete the work of coercion. Theodosius had not ordered, although he had failed to check, the general demolition of pagan temples. In the reign of Arcadius the

[1] For the legislation of Theodosius and his successors in relation to Christianity and paganism, see *Codex Theodosianus*, especially book xvi., and Chastel, *op. cit.* p. 180 f., 212 f., 227 f., 239 f.; Beugnot, *op. cit.* i. p. 356 f., ii. p. 10 f., p. 128 f., p. 173 f., p. 211 f.

Gothic invaders performed this work on their own account in Greece, and Arcadius sanctioned it in the East, at least in the country districts. His example was followed a few years later by Honorius in the West, and Theodosius II. ordered all the remaining temples to be destroyed. Zealous prelates, like Theophilus or Porphyry of Gaza, took delight in seeing that the demolition proceeded apace, and swarms of black-robed monks busied themselves with the congenial task.[1] Theodosius the Great had not interfered with private beliefs as distinct from worship: Theodosius II. excluded pagans from all military and judicial offices, and Justin I. extended the exclusion so as to cover all magistracies and posts of honour.[2] The work of final suppression was fitly undertaken by Justinian, whose natural intolerance was accentuated by the zeal of the

[1] There is ample evidence that many pagan temples were destroyed in the reign of Theodosius I., but apparently he never sanctioned it by any law (Chastel, *op. cit.* p. 202). In his *Pro Templis* Libanius made an eloquent remonstrance against the work of destruction. He speaks of the swarms of black monks (μελανειμονοῦντες) who delighted in it, and dwelt on the worthlessness of enforced conversion. Theophilus, Archbishop of Alexandria, was prominent in the work of extirpation in the East, as St. Martin was in the West.

[2] Under Theodosius I. eminent pagans like Themistius, Libanius, and Symmachus had retained posts of the highest honour (Libanius, *Pro Templis, ad fin.*). Arcadius maintained the same policy, but it was reversed by Theodosius II. and Honorius, and even more completely by Justin I. (Chastel, *op. cit.* pp. 203, 230, 243; *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 10-21). In this and other matters coercive action was taken earlier and more effectively in the East than in the West.

imperial courtesan who shared his throne; and to his intolerance Justinian added a keen appetite for legislation and a meticulous care for detail.[1] He attacked the points in which paganism still had some remaining strength. He struck a blow at the literary tradition by closing the schools of Athens, and he prohibited all gladiatorial shows and many of the ancient contests, including the Olympic games. Finally, in 531, he issued an edict commanding that all pagans should receive baptism, on pain of exile and confiscation of all their property.[2] Three months were allowed in which they must conform. This law was not permitted to become a dead letter. The bishops had been entrusted with a large share in the civil administration, and could call on the magistrates to enforce it. Some illustrious pagans suffered punishment, and large numbers submitted to baptism rather than face persecution.[3] Paganism was now abolished so far

[1] For the character and aims of Justinian, cp. Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, book iv. ch. 2 ("Justinian and Theodora"), and ch. 11 ("Justinian's Caesaropapism"). Professor Bury believes that the *Secret History*, which is the chief authority for scandals connected with Justinian and Theodora, was not written by Procopius, but was the work of a contemporary of Justinian, and rejects the damaging scandals as improbable, or at least grossly exaggerated. He notes the significance of Justinian's action in closing the schools of Athens, and cites the sweeping principle laid down in *Cod. Just.* i. v. 12, that "human goods are withheld from those who do not worship God rightly."

[2] For the legislation of Justinian in relation to Christianity and paganism, see *Codex Justinianus*, i., and Chastel, *op. cit.* p. 278 f.

[3] The powers of bishops in civil administration are laid down

as legislation could secure its abolition. But custom is sometimes stronger than law, and the student who follows the story of the final extinction of the old religion in the pages of Beugnot and Chastel will be surprised to discover how uneven and how slow in some regions was the operation of penal laws.[1] We must not digress into this interesting by-path of history. We may note that, even in the East, paganism was still found in the Peloponnese in the ninth century; and, speaking generally, it was more persistent in the West: many traces of it are found in Italy about 600, and in Gaul in the seventh century. Its last strongholds were generally in remote country districts, although scholars have now taught us to derive the word "paganus" from another source.[2]

in Justinian's *Codex* and *Novellae* (*e.g. Cod. Just.* i. 4, *De Episc. Audientia*). For the punishment or degradation of prominent pagans, see Chastel, *op. cit.* pp. 283-289. The evidence is derived from such writers as Joannes Malalas, Procopius, and Theophanes. Confiscation and exile were common punishments, but more severe measures were sometimes taken. In 561 some pagans were mutilated. Pholas poisoned himself to avoid a worse fate. Macedonius, Tribonian, Pegasius, and Asclepiodotus were amongst prominent officials who suffered. Hypatia is a notable instance of a pagan suffering at the hands of a Christian mob a century earlier.

[1] Beugnot, *Destruction du paganisme en Occident*, book xii.; Chastel, *Destruction du paganisme dans l'Empire d'Orient*, pp. 288-320. For the instance of the Mainotes in the Peloponnese, see Chastel, p. 306. I must acknowledge my deep obligations to these two most valuable books, especially to the latter, on which I have drawn freely for illustrations.

[2] For the derivation of "paganus," see Appendix, Note A, p. 371.

I have dwelt in some detail upon the course of imperial legislation in its endeavour to make the Church co-extensive with the Roman Empire, and we have seen its uncompromising character. We cannot but notice how complete was the abandonment under Theodosius, Justinian, and many less famous emperors, of the profession of complete religious liberty—*colendi libera facultas*—which was prominent in the Edict of Milan, and of which Constantine himself was never wholly forgetful. Even stronger is the contrast between this policy of coercion and the method which we observed to prevail in the New Testament. We can conceive no wider gulf between two ideas or principles than that which separates the disciple of the first century, gladly taking up his cross to follow Christ, from the terrorised proselyte of the fifth or sixth century, accepting baptism as an alternative to banishment and the loss of all that he possessed. And the first question that we ask is, How far was this coercive process welcomed or suggested by the Church? Do we meet with signs of independence and of reluctance to lean upon the secular arm, with indignant protests against the use of force or the appeal to unworthy motives? Alas! that the answer must be an unsatisfactory one. We look almost in vain during this period for such utterances as Tertullian's "nec religionis est cogere religionem," or Lactantius' "nihil est tam voluntarium quam religio."[1] Unhappily the Church soon

[1] Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*, 2 "sed nec religionis est cogere

learnt to make the most of imperial favour. The motive for doing so was not wholly bad: it may have been, to a large extent, laudable. It was tempting to find an instrument of enormous power suddenly placed at her disposal, ready for use against heretics within the fold, and for the suppression of the degrading worship of false gods without. The rapid change from persecution to favour was enough to turn cool heads; and to minds and hearts aflame for the enlargement of the Kingdom of God on earth it might seem almost impious to refuse the powerful aid by which its coming could be so greatly accelerated. That was the nobler side, and with it was mingled, no doubt, a more ignoble element of mere ambition and intolerance and cruelty. At all events, the fact remains that Christian bishops frequently incited the emperors to the work of coercion, and seldom, if ever, restrained them from it. Ambrose, one of the noblest figures of the age, who dared to inflict upon Theodosius a penance of deserved and salutary severity, maintained that the imperial power must be used to uphold the cause of God, and that for Jews, heretics, and idolaters there could be no toleration. Augustine, abandoning an earlier and sounder view, committed himself to a policy of persecution, based on a too literal interpretation of the isolated text,

religionem, quae sponte suscipi debet non vi; cum et hostiae ab animo libenti expostulentur." Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* v. 20 "Nihil est enim tam voluntarium quam religio, in qua si animus sacrificantis aversus est, jam sublata, jam nulla est."

"Compel them to come in." St. Chrysostom and St. Martin were forward in their zeal for the violent destruction of temples and altars. When these were the feelings of the greatest saints and leaders and doctors of the Church, we cannot wonder if we find a general acquiescence in, or rather a general demand for, a policy of coercion or of wholesale conversion, enforced by the secular power. The responsibility for coercion does not rest solely upon individual emperors, but must be shared by the Church as a whole.[1]

And what was the effect upon the Church herself? Let us look first at the relation of the Church to the civil power. We have seen the Church passing through the stages of toleration and favour to establishment, and, finally, almost to identification with the State. An unbaptised Emperor summons a general Council and enforces its decrees, appoints to bishoprics, legislates about the duties and privileges of the clergy and the property of the Church. An orthodox Emperor limits the Church to Catholics; an Arian Emperor expels Athanasius and endeavours to impose Arian standards. More and more the Emperor becomes the head of the Church on earth, and more and more the bishops approximate to the position of civil administrators. "At no other time," wrote Dr. Bigg, "have the clergy been reduced to such an Erastian servitude,"

[1] For patristic opinions on coercion and toleration, see Appendix, Note B, p. 372.

and his judgment was well grounded.[1] And with Erastianism sycophancy went hand in hand. The courage of an Ambrose was rare, and the subservience and flattery of an Eusebius were common. *Quid imperatori cum ecclesia?*[2] was the almost unique remonstrance of a great schismatic leader. In relation, then, to the civil power the Church, in acquiring a formidable ally, sacrificed in large measure her freedom and her independence.

The second result was that the Church inevitably became fashionable and worldly, and her spiritual standard was immensely lowered. The evidence for this statement is bewildering in its abundance and variety. We have already seen that the mere fact of Christianity becoming hereditary had tended to depress the standard. What, then, was likely to happen when men were forced to

[1] Bigg, *Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, p. 136. M. Duchesne (*Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, ii. ch. 17) shows how largely imperial intervention was due to the desire to suppress schism in the fourth century, and adds (p. 656): 'Devenu chrétien, l'empereur voulut bientôt convertir aussi l'Empire, et non seulement le convertir, mais faire de la nouvelle religion ce qu'on n'avait pu faire de l'ancienne, une institution officielle et universelle, une religion d'État. . . . L'Église s'y résigna. On ne voit nulle part qu'elle ait soulevé des objections de principe." The direct dependence of the *sacerdotium* on the *imperium* was more strongly marked in the East than in the West (Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, i. 186).

[2] The words were used by Donatus himself to the messengers of the Emperor Constans in A.D. 348, if we can rely on the account in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* viii. 776. Hatch (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 186) attributes them to the Donatist bishops at the Council of Carthage.

become Christians by fear of imperial displeasure, or by the threatened loss of every temporal possession and privilege? The records of this period abound in instances of wholesale transitions from paganism to Christianity, of the promiscuous baptism of hundreds or of thousands with no adequate instruction or catechumenate, and without the proof or the probability—often, it might be said, without the possibility—of any real change of belief.

To mention only a few examples. At Alexandria the destruction of the Serapeum was immediately followed by the instantaneous conversion of multitudes, who replaced the emblems of Serapis by the cross.[1] Protogenes, who preached in Egypt, encouraged the inhabitants to bring sick children to him to be healed, and refused to pray for any who were not baptised, thus causing a large nominal accession to the Church.[2] In Mesopotamia, the conversion of the governor of a city was at once followed by the conversion of all the inhabitants. At Constantinople, Justinian caused the pagans to be hunted out and assembled in a church to undergo a brief instruction, previous to baptism by a certain Bishop John, whom he afterwards sent on a similar mission through Asia Minor, where he baptised 70,000 converts.[3] An interest-

[1] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 16. This destruction took place in the reign of Theodosius I., at the direct request of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria.

[2] The story of Protogenes is related by Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 15.

[3] Chastel, *op. cit.* p. 289.

ing case of the forcible conversion of an individual meets us in the reign of Theodosius II. That emperor arrested Cyrus, one of the leading patricians of Constantinople, as a pagan. Cyrus, to save his life, not only declared himself a Christian, but (*ex abundanti cautela*) was ordained priest. Theodosius immediately caused him to be made bishop of a remote town in Phrygia. Cyrus reluctantly went into what was virtually exile, and reached his see just at the festival of Christmas. His flock, with malicious curiosity, insisted on his preaching to them on that very day. The brief sermon of the bishop *malgré lui* was a single sentence to the effect that such a mystery as that which is commemorated at Christmas is best celebrated in silence.[1] These instances are taken from the Eastern Empire; but the methods employed in the West, where paganism presented a more obstinate resistance, were very similar. It will suffice to cite a few instances from the life of Pope Gregory the Great. It is true that Gregory in one case disapproved of the forcible

[1] The story (referred to by Chastel, *op. cit.*) is narrated at length by Joannes Malalas, *Chronographia*, xiv. p. 362. Some of it is perhaps worth transcribing—*γνόντες δὲ οἱ τῆς πόλεως κληρικοὶ καὶ πολῖται ὅτι ὡς Ἕλληνα* (= Pagan) *ἔπεμψεν αὐτὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἵνα ἀποθάνῃ, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις γενεθλίοις ἐξαίφνης οὖν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἔκραξαν αὐτῷ προσομιλῆσαι· καὶ ἀναγκασθεὶς ἀνῆλθεν ὁμιλῆσαι. καὶ μετὰ τὸ δοῦναι εἰρήνην προσωμίλησεν οὕτως· "Ἀδελφοί, ἡ γέννησις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ σιώπῃ τιμάσθω. . . . αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν."* καὶ *εὐφημηθεὶς κατῆλθε, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ ἄχρι θανάτου.*

conversion of Jews in Gaul, but he did not act on this principle in dealing with pagans in Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia. He gives instructions that obstinate peasants are to be starved into surrender by the increase of their dues; and others, if slaves, are to be chastised, if freemen, to be placed in confinement, that by bodily torments they may be brought back to sanity of mind. Sometimes he adopted a milder method of persuasion by bribes. The agent on the papal estates in Sicily was instructed to induce the Jews there to embrace Christianity by offering a remission of rent of 25 per cent or 33 per cent, or even more if thought desirable. Gregory defends this procedure on the ground that, even if these men come to Christ with little faith, the Church will gain their children. On other occasions he approves of sending soldiers to coerce schismatics in Istria, or writes letters to Ethelbert and Brunichildis to exhort them to compel their heathen subjects to become Christians. When a really great Pope, of a naturally gentle disposition, sanctioned methods like these, we can well believe that a more drastic procedure was often adopted by men of sterner nature and less enlightenment.[1]

[1] Dudden, *Life of Gregory the Great*, ii. pp. 147-156, where numerous references are given to Gregory's letters. It is difficult to explain his lenient attitude towards Jews as compared with his unhesitating coercion of pagans, for in a letter about the treatment of the Jews he warns two bishops in Gaul that those who are brought to the baptismal font by compulsion, if they return to their former

These unreal conversions produced their inevitable fruit. Even Eusebius had observed the "unspeakable hypocrisy" of those who had crept into the Church and made a spurious profession of Christianity.[1] Hypocrisy naturally became common, and the laws which were passed against apostasy show that lapses from a creed which had been so hastily adopted were by no means rare. Naturally also many of the converts continued to practise pagan rites in secret, or to form a blend of pagan and Christian worship. In 493 Pope Gelasius found it necessary to issue a stern prohibition against Christians celebrating the Lupercalia, one of the most licentious of heathen festivals. In 625 the Council of Rheims inflicted penalties on Christians who took part in heathen observances.[2] Ecclesiastical legislation against magic continued for

superstition, will perish more grievously from the very cause which seemed to be the beginning of their new life; whereas, if they are won by gentleness, the minds of the converts will not return to their vomit again (*Epist.* i. 47, Migne, *P.L.* vol. lxxvii. col. 510).

[1] Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iv. 54 εἰρωνείαν τ' ἄλεκτον τῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑποδυομένων, καὶ τὸ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιπλάστως σχηματιζομένων ὄνομα. Cp. Augustine, *De Catech. Rudibus*, ch. 17.

[2] As to apostasy, there is abundant evidence in the patristic writings, the decrees of councils, and imperial legislation. It may suffice to note that between 381 and 396 four laws against apostasy were promulgated by Theodosius I., Valentinian II., and Arcadius (Beugnot, *Destruction du paganisme*, ii. 99). For the action of Gelasius as to the Lupercalia, cp. Beugnot, *op. cit.* pp. 274 f.; and for the decree of Rheims (A.D. 625), Migne, *Dictionnaire des Conciles.* The question of pagan survivals in Christianity is discussed in Appendix, Note C, p. 375.

500 years, and shows how persistent was the survival of this feature of paganism.

The Church, indeed, found it a task beyond her strength to absorb such a vast mass of paganism without herself undergoing a transformation. In truth she deliberately made compromises with regard to pagan rites and customs in order to facilitate the transition. Some of these may perhaps be deemed innocent or venial, such as the fixing of Christmas at the time of the Saturnalia, of the Purification at the Lupercalia, and of the Rogation Days at the Ambarvalia; a more doubtful case was the conversion of pagan temples into Christian churches.[1] But in other cases the "accommodation" was plainly pernicious in its effects. It is not a mere coincidence that the wide-spread abuses in connection with the worship of martyrs and the relics of saints first become prominent in the latter half of the fourth century. In the letters and poems of the saintly but superstitious Paulinus of Nola, we see that the

[1] For the possible connection between pagan and Christian festivals, see Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*; *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* s.v. "Christmas" and "Festivals of Mary." Duchesne (*Origines du culte chrétien*, ch. viii.) rejects the connection between Christmas and the pagan festivals. Gregory the Great changed his mind with regard to the policy of destroying temples, and urged that they should be turned into Christian churches (Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, ii. 126). It is worth while to compare *Epist.* xi. 66 (Migne) with *Epist.* xi. 76, and to note the reason which he gives in the latter, "Nam duris mentibus simul omnia abscidere impossibile esse non dubium est, quia is qui locum summum ascendere nititur necesse est ut gradibus vel passibus, non autem saltibus, elevetur."

abuse has grown to large dimensions, and that to the Campanian peasant the local saint was often merely the local genius or demi-god with a thin Christian veneer. Already Julian and Libanius had been able to scoff at Christians for worshipping, not one God, but a number of dead men. Protests came from men like Vigilantius and Faustus, but Vigilantius and Faustus were heretics or under suspicion of heresy. Augustine, indeed, repudiated the deification of martyrs, but ignorant peasants did not draw fine distinctions; and when Faustus declared that pagan sacrifices had been turned into *agapae* at the tombs of saints, and the idols into martyrs, and that the shades of the dead were appeased with wine and food, he represented what was not indeed the intention of the Church, but what was often the practical result of the system.[1] Jerome vindicated the policy of "accommodation," and Theodoret boldly proclaimed that the Lord had

[1] For the veneration of St. Felix at Nola, and the latent paganism of his worshippers, see Paulinus, *Natalitia* in honour of St. Felix (*e.g.* Poems 18-20, Migne), and cp. Boissier, *Fin du paganisme*, ii. 112 f.

Vigilantius had the misfortune to quarrel with Jerome, and our knowledge of him is largely due to Jerome's invective *In Vigilantium*, but there was at least much excuse for his sturdy protestantism.

Augustine (*De Vera Religione*, ch. 55) says distinctly "honorandi ergo sunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem," and he denies λατρεία to the saints in *Contra Faustum*, xx. 21, where he tries to refute the charges brought by Faustus.

For the ridicule of pagans like Libanius and Julian, see *Dict Christ. Biog.* s.v. "Patron Saints," where references are given.

raised the martyrs to the place of the heathen gods.[1] We cannot doubt that to a large extent the saints—or the heroes who lurked beneath the saints' names—were the real objects of popular worship rather than the Blessed Trinity. In some places, Beugnot asserts, pagans accepted the worship of the Blessed Virgin when they had refused to accept Christ, and he declares that after the Council of Ephesus, in which the Blessed Virgin was accorded the title of "Mother of God," eight temples in Sicily were quickly converted into churches dedicated to her honour.[2] And everywhere we find a growth of externalism and a development of ritual which had no corresponding increase of devotion underneath it.

Patristic literature presents us with abundant evidence of the disastrous effect of the wholesale and coercive method upon Christian morality and social life. No more cogent proof could be found than the discourses of St. Chrysostom at Antioch and at Constantinople, especially those which he delivered in the latter city; for we must remember that Constantinople was a city without pagan traditions. Chrysostom is never tired of denouncing the immorality of the theatre, which his hearers frequented, or of the games and races which often

[1] See Jerome's *In Vigilantium*, a fierce attack on the contention that the veneration of saints and martyrs was to be condemned as semi-pagan (*e.g.* § 4).

Theodoret, *Graecarum Affect. Curatio*, viii., "De Martyribus" (Migne, *P.G.*, vol. lxxxiii. col. 1033).

[2] Beugnot, *Destruction du paganisme*, ii. 271.

robbed him of his congregation, or the gulf between rich and poor, which yawned almost as widely then as now. It is a skin-deep Christianity which Chrysostom describes, an immense mass of indifferentism; men come to church only at the great festivals, they postpone baptism until their end is approaching, they are "lovers of pleasures rather than lovers of God"; everywhere there is the result of superficial conversions and interested motives, and the mingling of Jewish and pagan elements with the Christian doctrines and system.[1] Such a picture would have been overdrawn if it had been presented to us by Tertullian, or even by Cyprian; there is no reason to think it untrue of the latter part of the fourth century. Chrysostom, it may be said, was a preacher, and preachers, like satirists, may no doubt give to the darker side of things a too exclusive prominence. But other witnesses in different portions of this period give us the same impressions. Salvian depicts a thoroughly corrupted society; Jerome's letters describe a demoralised clergy; Ausonius is a type of the worldly man-of-letters, whose real interests were in Roman poetry and mythology, not in the religion which he professed.[2] St. Augustine makes frequent references

[1] The evidence from Chrysostom's writings is summarised in a careful study entitled *St Jean Chrysostome et les mœurs de son temps*, by M. A. Puech (Paris, 1891). See especially pp. 313-317, and cp. Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum Homiliae*, 37, 48, 88; *In Joannem*, 18. (Migne, *P.G.*, vol. lxix.)

[2] Salvian, *De Gubernatione Dei*, almost *passim*, *e.g.* iv. 17 and

to the deadness of spiritual life and the prevalence of worldly motives among his flock.[1] The higher standard was consistently upheld by saints and great teachers, and was no doubt kept in view by a considerable minority, but already the new leaven had fatally leavened every portion of the Church.

It was natural that the increasing worldliness of the Church should produce a reaction towards asceticism. The devotion which had once found its expression in the mere fact of discipleship, and afterwards in martyrdom, was now forced to seek a new channel. We saw the beginnings of this movement in the Ante-Nicene Church; it is far more strongly marked now. The immense development of monasticism in so many different forms falls within this period. The monks became ubiquitous,

vi. 13 "lugubre est referre quae vidimus . . . decrepitos Christianos . . . gulae ac lasciviae servientes."

Ausonius' attempt to dissuade his favourite pupil, Paulinus of Nola, from entering on a strict Christian life is well known. Cp. Paulinus, *Carm.* x. 20-24; and Dill, *Roman Society in Last Century of Western Empire*, p. 330 f.

The prevalent vices of the clergy are castigated by Jerome, *Epist.* 22 and 52 (Migne).

[1] St. Augustine, *In Joann. Tract.* xxv. 10 (quoted by Neander, *Church History*, iii. 138) "quam multi non quaerunt Jesum, nisi ut illis faciat bene secundum tempus . . . impletur talibus ecclesia. Vix quaeritur Jesus propter Jesum." Cp. also *Enarrat. in Psalm.* xxx. 11. 6, where St. Augustine describes pagans as deterred from embracing Christianity because of the low morality of nominal Christians, "quam multos enim putatis, fratres mei, velle esse Christianos, sed offendi malis moribus Christianorum?" and *De Catech. Rudibus*, chs. 25, 26.

first in the East, then in the West; they were untiring in the struggle against paganism, and they impressed their influence both for good and for evil very deeply on the Church.[1] Another result was the increasing separation of the clergy from the laity. The depression of the average meant that the clerical standard was required to be different, and this severance reacted in turn upon the lay standard, and caused it to sink still lower. Clerical celibacy now becomes first the ideal and then the rule. It required the robust humanism of a Synesius to hold out against it even in the fifth century.[2] Again, we have the formation and continued per-

[1] For some causes underlying the spread of monasticism, see Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 151 *seq.* He notes as one influence the cessation of persecution. "Persecution had ceased, but the idea of the merit of suffering had not ceased. There were those who, if they could not be martyrs in act, would at least be martyrs in will. They sought lives of self-mortification." The use of the words "religious" and "secular" in reference to the monastic rule, or its absence, is one striking evidence of the strength of the monastic idea. A fuller sketch of the development of monasticism will be found in Neander, *Church History*, iii. p. 322 f. The pagan hatred of the monks is sufficiently clear from Libanius.

[2] The character and views of Synesius, who made it a condition of becoming bishop that he should retain his athletics, his wife, his philosophy, and his own view of the Resurrection, form a most interesting study. See his Letters, *e.g. Epist.* 105, and cp. W. S. Crawford, *Synesius the Hellene*, esp. chs. vii. and x.

For the influence of clerical celibacy, cp. Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 159. It had an important effect in helping to isolate the clergy as a separate class. The details of legislation about it are given by H. C. Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, 3rd ed. chs. iv.-vi., and the divergence of Eastern and Western practice is there explained.

sistence of sects which adopted an exclusive or ascetic principle. The Montanism of the earlier period is followed by Novatianism, Donatism, and Priscillianism in this. These were all Puritan movements—attempts to create a spiritual Church inside a Church which had been secularised. And their very existence and vitality is a testimony to the reality of the evils against which they were a protest.[1]

Christianity, in its struggle with the paganism of the empire, obtained its final and complete external success by methods which it is impossible seriously to defend, and which Christian missionaries, we may hope, have now definitely abandoned. The Church was in too great a hurry; and from a

[1] Of the earlier asceticism something has already been said; cp. pp. 68, 74. Donatism was a most formidable movement. The Donatists obtained a firm hold on Africa, and kept it for a hundred years, until the country was overrun by the Vandals. None of the ascetic sectaries were more antagonistic to the Catholic Church, or threatened its unity more seriously, as is made plain by the anti-Donatist writings of Optatus and Augustine. The Circumcellions were only the left wing of the Donatists. The Donatists were the first sect to provoke coercion by the imperial power; cp. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *St. Augustine and African Church Divisions*, ch. 2. Priscillianism has often been greatly misjudged, and it is only in recent years that Priscillian's writings have been recovered. He was the first considerable thinker among Spanish Christians, and the sect always had its chief strength in Spain. Priscillian was accused of various doctrinal heresies, as well as of magic, but the ascetic side of his teaching, which was strongly marked, may well have been his main cause of offence amidst the laxity which then prevailed in Spain. The whole story of his life and condemnation is well told in Leclercq's *L'Espagne chrétienne*, ch. 3.

mixture of motives—for zeal for the glory of God and the saving of souls mingled with personal ambitions and institutional love of power—she was led to account secular favour and aid "a prize to be grasped at," and to consider the extent of her dioceses and the number of her converts as more important than the integrity of her spiritual life and the preservation of her first love. Her policy was mistaken, because she was untrue to vital principles; and therefore she lost in reality where she gained in appearance. We cannot, and need not, deny that there was a gain in some directions. It was a gain that impure and degrading worships should be replaced by a religion which, even in its less pure form, was morally far their superior. It was a gain that the vast system of the Roman law should be humanised and Christianised by a succession of emperors from Constantine to Justinian, that manners and customs should undergo a correcting and refining influence, and that this process should have been far advanced before the great collision came between the Empire and the barbarians. We may fully recognise what has been called the *diffusive* influence of Christianity.[1] That influence was and

[1] This question is further discussed in relation to the present day in lecture vii. (see p. 283). I cannot resist the conclusion that the "diffusive" influence of Christianity has been valued too highly by many historians, while the loss entailed by the abandonment of the policy of concentration has been overlooked. This seems to be the case even in Dean Church's illuminating sketch *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*. So too Mr. Gladstone (*Gleanings*, vol. vii. p. 147 f.), though admitting that, as the world became

is a great power for good in the world. But it is not the primary function of the Church to diffuse an elevating influence over the World. Its primary function is to make saints, and to preserve intact both its own existence as a Divine Society and also the treasure which it guards, in order that it may really *convert* the World.

It was here that the loss was incurred which outweighs the gain that we have tried to estimate. The line of demarcation between the Church and the World was now fatally obscured. The World, Bishop Westcott is reported to have said, got into the Church in the fourth century, and we have never since been able to get it out; or, if I may quote a bold metaphor used by my immediate predecessor in these lectures, the Spirit of the World "by inoculating society at large with a very dilute and attenuated serum of Christianity, secured for it a measure of immunity from violent and inconvenient attacks."[1] The Church made alliance with a World which became Christian in name, but only in name. It no longer cost anything to be a Christian; indeed, it cost much *not* to be one. The element of sacrifice in individual discipleship disappeared; the spiritual standard was degraded; the body corporate was corrupted. The Church

Christian, Christianity became worldly, was inclined to defend the incorporation of Christianity with civil authority and public law, on the ground that before the alliance progress was slow, and that without it immeasurable social results would not have been attained.

[1] J. H. F. Peile, *Reproach of the Gospel*, pp. 155-56.

embarked on a policy of coercion; the seeds were sown of a harvest of ill, the seeds of such abuses as the temporal claims of the Papacy, of such horrors as the Inquisition. If the Church before Nicaea was, in the main, faithful to the method and principles of her Master, the Church of the succeeding centuries deserted them. As we read the story we are forced to ask whether it be not true for the Church, as well as for the individual disciple, that friendship with the World is enmity with God, and that it is indeed possible for her to gain the whole World and yet to lose her own soul.

LECTURE IV

THE CHURCH AND THE BARBARIANS

ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ βιασταὶ ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν.
—St. Matt. xi. 12.

IV

THE CHURCH AND THE BARBARIANS

St. James i. 20: "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God."

THE course of our inquiry to-day will lead us through the period sometimes known as the "Dark Ages"—that obscure region of history which lies between the ancient and the modern world. We have traced the relations of the Church and the World in the New Testament; we have followed the fortunes of the Church through her period of persecution and suffering; and last week we watched the *facilis descensus* by which, in the very centuries when paganism was being forcibly destroyed for her benefit, the Church herself became more and more secularised and assimilated to the World. The completion of this process by legislation we associated with the great name of Justinian, who has been aptly compared to a colossal Janus looking backward upon the old Empire and forward towards the system of the Middle Ages.[1] To-day our task is to examine the action and policy of the Church with regard to the

[1] Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, i. 351.

barbarians, those new and vigorous races which from the fourth century onwards spread themselves over the Roman Empire, submerging the ancient landmarks and altering the whole face of Europe. Our method can no longer be strictly chronological. The process of invasion was a slow one: the process of the so-called "conversion" of these races was still more protracted. It began before Justinian, and it is difficult to assign any date at which it can be said to have been completed.[1] The inhabitants of Pomerania and Prussia were not—even nominally—converted until the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; Lithuania was only evangelised late in the fourteenth.[2] But the greater part of the task was completed before A.D. 1000, and, roughly speaking, the preceding five hundred years may be regarded as the great missionary period of the Church in respect of the barbarian races. The reign of Charles the Great falls in the middle of the period, and his name is inseparably associated with the process of conversion. In the earlier centuries the evangelisation of the new races in

[1] Some of the earlier "conversions" of Teutonic tribes are narrated by Socrates, *e.g.* that of the Burgundians (*Hist. Eccl.* vii. 30). Being hard pressed by the Huns, they considered that "the God of the Romans" had shown Himself powerful, and applied to a Gallic bishop for wholesale baptism, which was given after seven days' instruction. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 7) recounts the conversion of the Iberians beyond Armenia owing to a vow made by their king in time of danger. This was about A.D. 330.

[2] Hardwick, *Church History* (*Middle Age*), pp. 223, 230, 335.

some parts of Europe was going on side by side with the extirpation of paganism amongst the old Roman or Romanised population, but for our present purpose we must concentrate our attention on the former task. The contact with the barbarians had a profound and lasting influence upon the Church; yet its true significance and effect have, I think, largely escaped the notice of ecclesiastical historians.

It was in the year 410 that the capture and sack of Rome—the *urbs eterna* which men had deemed as inviolable as the Empire itself—gave the most signal proof of the irresistible power of the new races. Twenty years later St. Augustine, the spiritual dictator of the Western Church, breathed his last while the barbarian armies were encamped before the walls of Hippo. The greater part of the intervening period was spent by St. Augustine in the composition of his most famous work, *De Civitate Dei. The City of God* is a philosophy, or rather a theology, of history, a comprehensive attempt to "justify the ways of God to man." It was written at a critical epoch in the fortunes of mankind. It looks back upon the old world of Greco-Roman paganism; it exposes the weaknesses and the immorality of the old system of religion; it refutes the view that the disaster of the sack of Rome was due to the victory of Christianity. And then, the polemic finished, St. Augustine looks forward to the new era which is dawning upon mankind, and with his exposition of the Christian scheme of life

and doctrine he portrays the great conception of the City of God, a city without earthly frontiers, without distinctions of nationality or secular status, of civilisation or barbarism, a city which comprises the dead not less than the living, a city whose citizenship depends upon participation in a common faith, obedience to common laws, inspiration by a common life—the life *secundum spiritum*—a heavenly *civitas*, set up in the midst of the *civitas hominum*, yet for ever distinct from it and founded upon a contrary principle.[1] It was a grand and inspiring conception, and in the strength of it St. Augustine could regard the disasters and the horrors which were thickening round him with serene and confident hopefulness. Unhappily, however, St. Augustine was inconsistent with the principles of his own conception, and fell into the error of building the City of God not upon the foundation of freedom, but upon the foundation of force; and if for centuries afterwards the walls of that city have been daubed with untempered mortar, it is due in no small degree to the authority of his great name. Upon the question of coercing heretics into orthodoxy he hesitated for some time before

[1] Cp. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, xi. 1, and xix. 17, "haec ergo caelestis civitas dum peregrinatur in terra ex omnibus gentibus cives evocat, atque in omnibus linguis peregrinam colligit societatem; non curans quidquid in moribus, legibus, institutisque diversum est quibus pax terrena vel conquiritur, vel tenetur." (The whole chapter is very important.) The relation of the *De Civitate Dei* to the circumstances of the time is well brought out by Boissier, *Fin du paganisme*, ii. 357-390.

he committed himself to the persecuting side; and in one of his letters he records that his change of view was caused by his actual experience of the apparently successful application of coercion to the Donatists.[1] Towards the dying paganism which the Church was combating he shows no forbearance. In his anxiety to see it completely effaced by Christianity he is willing to turn against it the self-same penal laws under which the Church had once suffered at its hands.[2] With the conversion of the barbarian races he was not so directly concerned, but undoubtedly he would have sanctioned the same methods with regard to them as with regard to the civilised paganism of his time. And the Church, as we shall see, was not slow in applying those methods to her new enterprise.

It is not necessary for us to trace in detail the successive waves of barbarian invasion by which Teutons, Slavs, and Huns—Visigoths and Ostrogoths—Franks, Vandals, and Lombards, overran

[1] See Note B in Appendix to lecture ii. (p. 374); and Augustine, *Epist.* 93, ch. 5. For the influence of St. Augustine on the history of persecution, see Appendix, Note A, p. 377.

[2] It must be remembered that some of St. Augustine's utterances on coercion have reference primarily to heretics, not to pagans, but the case of pagans is dealt with in *Epist.* 93, ch. 2 "quis enim nostrum, quis vestrum non laudat leges ab imperatoribus datas contra sacrificia paganorum? Et certe longe ibi poena severior constituta est; illius quippe impietatis capitale supplicium est." Indeed, while he once doubted about the coercion of heretics, St. Augustine does not appear ever to have had any scruple about the forcible suppression of paganism. (Boissier, *op. cit.* ii. 368.)

the Roman Empire.[1] As early as the second century the pressure of the great "Wandering of the Nations" had been felt upon the Danube, and efforts had been made by the emperors to buy off the barbarians or to incorporate them in the Roman legions. In the middle of the third century the Goths defeated and killed the Emperor Decius, and the Alamanni threatened the Roman armies on the Rhine. Isolated victories were of no avail to turn back the resistless tide, and amid the increasing degeneracy and depopulation of the Empire even isolated victories could no longer be reckoned on. Gradually the barbarian advance changed in character. It became less and less a series of predatory incursions or temporary settlements.[2] Alaric first set the example of winning a kingdom. Theodoric first established a state in which Goths and Italians were united. The battle of Châlons and the death of Attila delivered Western Europe from the fiercer barbarism of the Huns. The Vandals, the most savage of the Teutonic invaders, spent the main fury of their attack in the devastation of Spain and Northern Africa. By the year 500 the Western Empire had been parcelled out into a number of barbarian kingdoms, and the process of the formation of new nations had begun. Already the answer was being given to the two questions

[1] Dr. Hodgkin's great work, *Italy and her Invaders* (8 vols.), is an invaluable guide, and Dean Church's *Beginning of the Middle Ages* gives a wonderfully clear sketch of a tangled period.

[2] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. iii.

of vital moment to the world—(1) What was to be the fate of Roman civilisation at the hands of the barbarian conquerors? (2) What was to be the relation of the barbarians to the Catholic Church? It is with the latter question that we are concerned; but the two questions cannot be wholly divorced. The attitude of the barbarians to the Roman Empire and the old civilisation was largely affected by their attitude to Christianity. It is true, no doubt, that the Gothic chieftains were often profoundly impressed by the vast and ordered system of the Empire, that they were ready to do homage to the far-off Emperor on the Bosphorus, and to prize the title of "Consul" or "Patrician";[1] but it is equally certain that the fierceness of their impact was softened by their acceptance of Christianity, even though its principles controlled their actions only in a most limited and imperfect manner. Alaric, Odoacer, and Theodoric all professed Christianity. Gothic Christianity was mainly due to Ulfilas, the apostle of the Balkans, who had devoted forty years of his life to the evangelisation of his Gothic countrymen. No doubt there, as everywhere else, the conversion was often of a wholesale and tribal kind; but Ulfilas was unsparing in his labours, and both his great enterprise of translating the Scriptures into Gothic, and his deliberate omission of the Books of Kings as being dangerous reading for a naturally warlike people, point to

[1] Church, *Middle Ages*, p. 16; Bryce, *op. cit.* p. 17; Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, ch. i.

methods somewhat less superficial than those which afterwards prevailed.[1] But Ulfilas was an Arian, and he impressed his own Arianism upon the Goths. This fact was of great and disastrous importance in the history of the Church. In the eyes of the inhabitants of Italy and Gaul, the Gothic invaders were heretics and schismatics. The Arian conquerors were hardly less contemptuous of the Catholic party. Rival hierarchies were established side by side. Toleration, such as that shown by Theodoric, was rare;[2] fierce persecution was common. Nowhere was it fiercer than in Spain and in Africa. In the latter country the Vandal ruler, Hunnerich, turned against the Catholics the very laws by which Catholic emperors had endeavoured to exterminate Arianism, and showed, by a simple though fruitless object-lesson, that those who took the sword might expect, with any turn of fortune, to perish by the sword.[3] For

[1] For the conversion of the Goths, see Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 33-34; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 37; and Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 33. The statement about the omission of the Books of Kings is preserved by Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 5, who tells us rather more about the life of Ulfilas. There is a careful monograph, *Ulfilas, Apostle of the Goths*, by the Rev. C. Anderson Scott (1885).

[2] Theodoric is represented as saying, "religionem imperare non possumus, quia nemo cogitur ut credat invitus" (Cassiodorus, *Var.* ii. 27, quoted by Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, iii. 441). Theodoric was a man of real enlightenment, and his toleration seems to have been due to conviction, not merely to policy. He tolerated not only Catholics, but Jews.

[3] Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, iii. 282. The Vandal persecutions were, on the whole, spasmodic; and the Vandals attacked

some generations it seemed probable that Arianism and not Catholicism would be the faith of Western Europe. The ultimate triumph of Catholicism was due, humanly speaking, to the ascendency gained by the Franks, and to their identification, through the conversion of Clovis, with the Catholic cause.

The Church of the fifth and following centuries was thus confronted with the immense task of absorbing and assimilating this great mass of non-Christian population. The task was indeed two-fold. Tribes which still professed heathenism must be brought to accept Christianity, and Arians must be converted to Catholicism. The labour was undertaken with no lack of zeal and fervour; and, if we cannot shut our eyes to the radically false methods which were so widely adopted, we must freely acknowledge the saintly lives and apostolic labours of a long line of missionaries—men among whom St. Martin of Tours and St. Patrick, Aidan and Columbanus and Boniface, Ansgar and Adelbert, Cyril and Methodius, are only a few of the more conspicuous names. In many cases we have only the most imperfect data for judging the work and methods of an individual missionary. Nor is it our business to judge individuals: we are only concerned with the methods adopted by the Church as

bishops and destroyed churches, but did not systematically coerce laymen. The edict of Hunnerich is translated in full in Leclercq's *L'Afrique chrétienne*, ii. pp. 190-195. It recites many details of the imperial legislation against Arians, and proceeds: "Such are the laws which we intend to apply to Homoousians convicted of having been or of being implicated in this false creed."

a whole, and with their results. And, speaking broadly, it is, unhappily, indisputable that the Church sanctioned the application among the barbarian tribes of the same mistaken principles which she had accepted in the struggle with Greco-Roman paganism. The old theory of a national or imperial State religion, which Christianity in her early days of suffering had combated and seemed to have overthrown, the Church now brought back in a new shape. She seemed to have forgotten Christ's principles of individual sacrifice as the test of discipleship and of the distinctness of the spiritual society from the world. By a strangely perverted exegesis, the single text from the parable of the Great Supper, "Compel them to come in," was allowed to outweigh a great mass of teaching and warning on the other side.[1] In her anxiety to gather mankind together into the City of God, the Church cared little or nothing as to men's motives for entrance or their spiritual qualifications. Sometimes she merely swept in converts by wholesale and indiscriminate acceptance; often she employed coercion, naked and undisguised, to attain her ends. We may take a few instances, some of them quite well-known ones, which illustrate what we may call respectively the "wholesale" and the "coercive" methods. Under the former we may include the indiscriminate con-

[1] St. Luke xiv. 23 ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν. Cp. St. Augustine, *Epist.* 93, ch. 2; 185, ch. 6.

Bayle, as we shall see later, devoted a special treatise to this text and its influence on the history of persecution. See Appendix, Note A, p. 377, on St. Augustine's influence upon persecution.

version and baptism of converts without individual preparation or conviction; under the latter, the application of undue influence or of force, in whatever degree, from the fear of the displeasure of a chieftain to the infliction of the death-penalty. But it is not always possible to discriminate clearly between the two methods.

Of the wholesale methods, perhaps no better illustration could be found than the celebrated story of the baptism of Clovis, narrated by Gregory of Tours, and familiar to every reader of Gibbon or of Milman.[1] It is a typical case of the conversion of a king or a chieftain—often as the result of a vow to be performed if success were gained in battle—followed by the wholesale conversion of his people or tribe. Clovis had married a Christian wife, Clotilda, but had resisted her attempts to convert him until the day when, hard pressed by the Alamanni at the battle of Tolbiac, he invoked the God of Clotilda and of the Christians. He won a decisive victory, and Remigius was not slow to remind him of his appeal and of his vow. Clovis sought the assent of his warriors, who were prepared

[1] The conversion of Clovis is narrated by Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, ii. 30, 31, who notes the parallel between the conversion of Clovis and that of Constantine ("procedit novus Constantinus ad lavacrum," ch. 31). Cp. Hodgkin, *op. cit.* vii. pp. 4-10; Gibbon, ch. 38. The reign of Clovis after his conversion was stained with hideous bloodshed, and Gregory (ii. 40) pauses in the recital of his crimes to observe that "God increased his dominion, because he walked before Him with a perfect heart" (Bright, *Early English Church History*, p. 440).

to follow him in adopting the new and more powerful God. At the bidding of Remigius, Clovis was baptised on Christmas Day 496, together with 3000 of his warriors, and proceeded, in compliance with the saint's command, to "adore what he had burnt, and to burn what he had adored." The conversion of Clovis was of vital importance, in that it enlisted the Frankish kingdom on the side of Catholic Christianity in the struggle against Arianism;[1] but how little it involved any real appreciation of Christianity and Christian standards of life on the part of Clovis and his successors, of their courtiers and warriors, and of the mass of the Frankish people who followed their chiefs, the pages of Gregory of Tours are the best evidence. Hardly anywhere, I imagine, can there be found a blacker and more unrelieved chronicle of avarice and drunkenness, outrage and murder, polygamy, adultery and incest, than in his account of the history of Gaul before and during his own times. The hideous crimes of Fredegund and Brunichild in the sixth century may serve as a single illustration of this statement: for sheer horror and wickedness they could not be surpassed, though they were not seldom imitated.[2]

[1] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 4.

[2] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, *passim*, *e.g.* vi. 36, 41; vii. 15; viii. 29, 41; ix. 34, 39; x. 14, 27.

Cp. Church, *Middle Ages*, p. 96. Comparing Gregory's chronicle with that of Bede, he writes, "The characteristic passages of Gregory's history of the Franks are tragedies of dark and dreadful crime, to which the stories of Oedipus and Lear are tame, and they are told with unmoved composure."

The conversion of Vladimir in Russia, although it took place nearly 500 years later, may be placed alongside of the baptism of Clovis. According to the well-known story, envoys from the different religions of the world came to Vladimir—Jews, Mussulmans, representatives of the Western and of the Eastern Churches. Vladimir sent a number of his nobles to examine and report upon the various faiths and modes of worship. The envoys who visited Constantinople were awe-struck at the magnificence of St. Sophia and its ritual, and their reports made a deep impression upon Vladimir. But to him, as to Clovis and to Constantine, the crisis came in the hour of battle. He besieged the city of Cherson in the Crimea, and vowed that, if he were successful in taking it, he would receive Christian baptism. Cherson fell. Vladimir was baptised, and secured the sister of the Emperor Basil in marriage by threatening to destroy Constantinople as he had destroyed Cherson. The new convert was not content to rule over an unbaptised people. He made known his wish that they should undergo baptism. He caused the great wooden idol Perun to be scourged across country and thrown into the river Dnieper; after which the whole people of Kief plunged into the river, while the priests read the baptismal prayers from the bank. This is perhaps the most striking recorded instance of the promiscuous baptism of a whole people; but the forcible destruction of temples and the exposure of the impotence of the idols, followed by the

acceptance of Christianity on the part of a rude tribe thus robbed of its former objects of veneration, is one of the most common features of missionary work during all this period.[1]

We may naturally look to our own country, and ask how far the process of conversion was carried on by these wholesale tribal methods. In Britain, on the whole, a gentler and more discriminating policy was generally adopted. Ethelbert, it is said, refused to compel any of his subjects to become Christians, although he showed greater favour to those who followed his own example. Aidan and his followers relied upon the spiritual methods of patient persuasion and the example of saintly lives in the conversion of Northumbria. Yet even in Britain we find many indications of conversions which can only be called promiscuous. Gregory the Great noted with satisfaction that St. Augustine had baptised more than 10,000 Angles on one Christmas Day, and in Bernicia Paulinus made converts with scarcely less rapidity. Wilfrid's biographer records that the heathen South Saxons gave up their idols "quidam voluntarie, alii vero coacti regis imperio." Idolatry was prohibited by law first in Kent and then in other kingdoms, and the work of iconoclasm

[1] *Chronique dite de Nestor* (Paris, 1884), chs. 40, 43. Vladimir's proclamation was to the effect that "whosoever, rich or poor, shall not come to-morrow to the river to receive baptism, will fall into disgrace in my sight." Whereupon the next day an innumerable host of people was baptised in the presence of the king.

Cp. Mouravieff, *History of Russian Church* (English translation, 1844), ch. i.; Stanley, *Eastern Church*, lecture ix.

was carried out sometimes voluntarily, sometimes under royal patronage and assistance. Gregory urged upon Augustine the conversion of temples into churches in preference to their destruction; but the process of compromise and accommodation was sometimes pushed too far, with the practical result that pagan rites and modes of thought lingered alongside of, and were fused with, popular Christianity. Thus Bede tells us that Retwald, king of East Anglia, had under the same roof a Christian altar and an altar on which to sacrifice to demons; and the Councils and Penitentials of the eighth century afford evidence that idolatry, magic, divination, and various pagan rites and superstitions constituted an ever-present danger. Nor was England exempt from the general rule that promiscuous acceptance of Christianity was followed by wholesale apostasy when troubles arose, or when a new ruler set the example of returning to the old faith.[1]

[1] For the methods of Augustine, Paulinus, and Aidan, and for Retwald, see Bede, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 26, 130; ii. 5, 14, 15; iii. 5, with the notes in Mr. Plummer's edition. For the advice given by Gregory to Augustine, cp. Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 30, and for his reference to Augustine's wholesale baptism, his letter to Eulogius, *Epist.* viii. 30. The remark about Wilfrid's methods is preserved in Eddius, *Vita Wilfridi*, ch. 41. I owe these last three references to Mr. Plummer's notes to Bede, book i., and I must make special acknowledgment of his valuable comments on Bede, i. 26, 30; ii. 14. He there refers to the Councils of Ratisbon and Clovesho, which were held in the same decade as the Council of Lestines (of which some further account is given on p. 154), and to the Penitentials of Theodore and Egbert, as showing the ever-present danger of idolatry, divination, etc., among nominal con-

In Ireland, again, the process of conversion seems to have been mainly tribal. Chiefs were converted, and their tribes quietly accepted the new religion. It is said that there is no record of any martyrdom on Irish soil during the evangelisation of Ireland.[1]

In the instances which we have so far examined, and which could be multiplied a hundred-fold from the history of mediaeval missions in Western Europe, the element of coercion has mingled in greater or less degree with tribal feeling, fashion, the desire to gain the favour of a chief, and other motives which accelerated the acceptance of Christianity. But we have not yet seen coercion carried to its furthest extreme of conversion at the point of the sword, with the naked alternative of death or baptism. Three classical instances of this stage of coercion are afforded by the policy of Charles the Great in the conversion of the Saxons, by the operations of the Teutonic knights and other military orders, and by the evangelisation of Scandinavia under Olaf Tryggvason and Olaf the Saint.

The work of the great English missionary, Boniface, in Germany had not lacked either support from the civil power or rapid success; indeed, he was

verts. (Cp. Labbé, *Concilia*, vi. 1535-1547, 1565-1601.) Instances of actual apostasy occur in Bede, ii. 15, 20; iii. 1, 30. Cp. Bright, *Early English Church History*, ch. vii.

[1] I owe this statement to my friend, Dr. Bernard, the Dean of St. Patrick's. The methods of St. Patrick were pacific and straightforward, but he saw the advantage of working through tribal sentiment, and began his work of conversion "from above and not from below" (Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 74).

credited with having baptised 100,000 natives in a few years. Boniface's methods, though perhaps wholesale, were comparatively pacific; but, in spite of the protests of his scholar-friend and adviser, Alcuin, Charles the Great was not content with so mild a policy.[1] He determined that the advance of the Gospel should proceed hand in hand with the advance of his own kingdom, and more than thirty years of his life were occupied with wars which were directed at once against Saxon independence and Saxon heathenism. Historians have remarked that Charles's favourite reading was Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*; and to the Emperor's zealous and masterful temperament it was intolerable that his subjects, or any tribes which lay within reach of his armies, should refuse to enter the City of God. Charles's expeditions were accompanied by warrior-bishops and abbots; idols and sacred trees were hewn down by force; multitudes were baptised under pain of death, falsely declaring, says the chronicler, that they desired to become Christians. Tithes were enforced upon the new converts, and the observance

[1] For Alcuin's protests, see *infra*, p. 149.

The rapid conversions effected by Boniface are mentioned by Gregory III. (*Epist.* i., Migne, *P.L.* vol. lxxxix., c. 576). Boniface appears not to have employed actual coercion, but the violent destruction of the sacred oak of Thor was one of his most conspicuous acts. For his vast missionary labours see his correspondence with Popes Gregory III. and Zacharias (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* vol. lxxxix.); and cp. Neander, *Church History*, v. 61 f. (Eng. Transl.; T. & T. Clark, 1851), and Hardwick, *Church History* (*Middle Age*), p. 20 f.

of Lent was commended to them by the imposition of the death-penalty for the eating of meat during that season, no less than for apostasy or contumacious continuance in heathenism. In spite of—or, perhaps, in consequence of—these drastic methods, revolts were frequent, and revolt was usually accompanied by apostasy. Such offences were severely punished. On one occasion Charles beheaded 4500 Saxons, and then retired into winter-quarters to celebrate the birthday of the Prince of Peace. Later in his reign he resorted to wholesale transportation of the inhabitants. The great Emperor's persistence was rewarded in the end by the outward semblance of conformity; and "Christianity, *or a religion which believed itself to be Christianity*" (the italics are mine, but the words are those of Dr. Hodgkin) "was triumphant from the Rhine to the Elbe."[1]

There is no need to accumulate horrors by dwelling in detail upon the proceedings of the knightly "Order of the Sword," which "evangelised" Livonia—if, indeed, we can use such a word in such a context—at the beginning of the thirteenth century, with the approbation of both Pope and Emperor; or upon those of the Teutonic Knights who, later in the same period, devastated Prussia and dragooned

[1] Hodgkin, *Charles the Great*, ch. vi. Cp. p. 109, "The king held a general assembly at Düren [in 775], at which, apparently, the programme of 'Christianity or death' for the Saxons was submitted and approved." Cp. Einhard, *Vita Caroli*, ch. vii. The severity of Charles's coercive measures, when he organised the conquered country, is shown in the provisions of the *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae* (quoted by Hodgkin, *op. cit.* p. 113).

the inhabitants into a nominal conformity.[1] It is a melancholy record of bloodshed and oppression; the crusading spirit has run mad, and is applying itself, not to the work of recovering the Holy Land from the Moslem, but to the task of extending the boundaries of Christendom among the heathen.

Our last illustration—the conversion of Norway by Olaf Tryggvason and Olaf the Saint—exhibits the process of coercion as enforced, not by an external conqueror like Charles the Great or the military Knights, but by a king upon his own people. The Saga tells the story of Olaf Tryggvason's enterprise with naïve simplicity.[2]

"Olaf, when he became king, saith he will bring about the christening of all Norway, or die else . . . so then East in the Wick were all men christened . . . then fared the king into the north parts of the Wick and bade all men take Christening: but those who gainsaid him he mishandled sorely: some he slew, some he drove away from the land . . . and that summer and the winter after was all the Wick christened." So again, at Dragseid Olaf summoned the "Thing," "and at the end of his speaking the

[1] For the methods of the knightly orders see Hardwick, *Church History* (*Middle Age*), p. 233; Neander, *Church History*, vii. 51, 60; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vii. 330. "There was a complete Mahommedan invasion, the Gospel or the Sword. . . . It became the perpetual German Crusade." A more detailed account in Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, iv., s.v. "Deutschorden."

[2] See *The Story of King Olaf Tryggvason* (Saga Library, vol. iii. 1893), chs. 59-83.

king bade them have one of two choices, either take christening or make them ready for battle with him." It is the same story everywhere throughout his dominions, not only in Norway, but in the Orkneys, in Iceland, in Greenland; the only variation is that sometimes the forcible destruction of the idols proved sufficient, and sometimes torture was necessary to induce the obstinate Scandinavians to desert their ancient gods. The work was carried on in the same spirit and by precisely the same methods by Olaf the Saint in the eleventh century, until the religion of Odin had nominally been replaced by the religion of Christ.[1]

This survey—a tedious one, I fear—of some of the more indefensible cases of wholesale or forcible conversions may now be brought to a close. It must not be thought that these undesirable methods were absolutely universal, or that there were no missionaries who adopted a sounder and more patient and more Christ-like procedure. Undoubtedly there were some; and it is also true that after the nominal conversion of a tribe or people missionaries generally remained behind to build up the work and to change the nominal acceptance into something more real and vital and permanent. Again, there were some prominent thinkers or leaders who protested against the wholesale, and still

[1] Hardwick, *Church History* (*Middle Age*), p. 118. Neander, *Church History*, vi. 34-49. For other countries in which we have evidence of the adoption of coercive or wholesale methods, see Appendix, Note B, p. 378.

more against the coercive policy, which they saw to be both inconsistent with Christian principles and barren of enduring results. The earlier remonstrances of men like Lactantius and Hilary find an echo in the noble toleration shown by the Gothic king Theodoric, and in the language used by such men as Alcuin and Raymond Lull. Several times in Alcuin's extant letters we find such a protest recurring. For instance, he writes to Arno, Archbishop of Salzburg: "Of what use is baptism without faith?" (he is speaking of the baptism of adults)—"how can a man be compelled to believe what he does not believe? A man can be coerced into baptism, but he cannot be coerced into faith." Alcuin applied his principle to explain the constant apostasies of the unhappy Saxons, and he hinted to his imperial friend and master that he would do well to be less strict in exacting tithes and less prodigal of threats; but his counsels fell on deaf ears.[1] More than four centuries later, Raymond Lull, a truly great scholar and missionary, convinced himself of the impossibility of exterminating the Saracens by force, and devoted his life to the development of sounder methods of propagating the faith by preaching and by argument.[2]

[1] Alcuin (ed. Migne), *Epist.* 36 "impelli potest homo ad baptismum, sed non ad fidem"; also *Epist.* 33 (a long letter about the Huns to the Emperor); 3 (to Colcus); and 42 (to Megenfrid, a Privy Councillor). Cp. Hardwick, *Church History* (*Middle Age*), p. 25.

[2] Raymond Lull, born in Majorca in 1236, is perhaps the most interesting of all mediaeval missionaries. His life was

But these were only the rare protests of lonely thinkers, men of greater spiritual stature than their fellows; and they passed well-nigh unheeded. The methods of indiscriminate baptism and forcible conversion were sanctioned by the general conscience of the Church, and were widely, though not universally, applied. They were carried out until the extirpation of heathenism in Europe was nominally completed by the evangelisation of the Lithuanians and their neighbours.[1] As regards Jews and Mahommedans, coercive treatment was not universally applied. Sometimes they were tolerated, but forced to dwell apart. But coercive treatment was by no means rare. For instance, we find forcible methods used against the Mahommedans in Spain in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when they were given the choice of conforming, or

devoted to the elaboration of the *Ars Generalis*, a philosophical system by which he hoped to convert unbelievers, and to missionary work amongst Mahommedans, in which he relied solely upon argument and persuasion. He was martyred in North Africa in 1315. (See Neander, *Church History*, vii. pp. 83-96, and an appreciative article by Dr. Zöckler in Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, vol. xi.)

Döllinger (*Historical and Literary Addresses*, p. 235) also mentions Rupert of Deutz (twelfth century) and Marsilius of Padua as opponents of coercion, and observes that the Germanic tribes in their earlier stages were opposed to it.

Some passages in Bede's writings may also be taken to show that he realised the superiority of voluntary methods of conversion, though he records wholesale conversions without any sign of disapproval (see Plummer's note on Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 26).

[1] Hardwick, *Church History* (*Middle Age*), ch. xiii.

of leaving Spain, or of becoming serfs.[1] In the same country and in some other parts of Europe the Jews also were subjected to coercive treatment, and nominal conversions were frequent. Sometimes the coercion stopped short at the compulsory sermons with which Robert Browning has familiarised us, and with the infliction of minor insults and punishments—

> "By the Ghetto's plague, by the garb's disgrace,
> By the badge of shame, by the felon's place,
> By the branding tool, the bloody whip,
> And the summons to Christian fellowship—
> We boast our proof that at least the Jew
> Would wrest Christ's name from the Devil's crew."[2]

Persecution and coercion may have many different degrees, and they were applied to different classes of men—to pagan, Jew, Mahommedan, to Arian or other heretic; and often less mercy was shown to the heretic than to the pagan. But the underlying principles were always the same—from the persecution of Priscillian, the first martyr-heretic, whose real offence was perhaps not so much heresy as asceticism (*nimia religio*),[3] down to that of the obstinate Saxons, who opposed themselves to the missionary

[1] For the treatment of Mahommedans and Jews, see Appendix, Note C, p. 381.

[2] R. Browning, *Holy Cross Day.*

[3] For Priscillian, see lecture iii., p. 122, and Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne*, ch. iii. On page 195 Leclercq quotes the statement of Pacatus, a contemporary writer, that Euchrotia, who was condemned and executed with Priscillian, suffered for "nimia religio et diligentius culta Divinitas."

efforts of Charles the Great, or that of the last victim of the Spanish Inquisition. And the first step — the step which costs — is taken towards persecution as soon as the essential principles of freedom of choice, of the individual character of discipleship, and of the fundamental separateness of the spiritual society from the secular order are overlooked and abandoned.[1]

Such, then, were the methods by which the Church undertook and, in an external sense, achieved, the conversion and absorption of the barbarian races. It may naturally occur to us to ask whether the foundations thus laid for Christendom were not laid in the sand rather than in the rock, and whether the walls of the edifice may not contain a large proportion of "wood, hay, and stubble." So far as the question concerns our own day and the extent to which we now are reaping the results of the Church's former policy, it will be better to postpone the inquiry until a later lecture. But we may glance now at a few of the more immediate

[1] Perhaps I may be forgiven for quoting here some wise words of Dr. Hodgkin, based on a profound study of the relation of the Church to the barbarian races during many centuries (*Italy and her Invaders*, vol. ii. pp. 548-550): "Would that the new religion had always thus calmly addressed herself to the consciences of mankind, that she had never shouted, nor shrieked, nor tortured, in order to enforce the acceptance of her message! Earth would be by many degrees more like Heaven at this day if she had thus remained true to her first gentle instincts. . . . For some generations, with quiet, earnest deliberateness, the whole power of the Emperors was employed in making all Christians think alike, and in preventing non-Christians from thinking at all."

results, although some of them have been indicated earlier in this lecture, and some are exactly parallel to those which we traced last week as the outcome of the forcible destruction of the old Greco-Roman paganism, and cannot indeed be treated separately from them. It is a survey from which we would fain avert our eyes, for it is surely a fact of grim and terrible significance that the geographical extension and external triumph of Christianity, which was intended to be the Light of the World, coincided with the beginning of that period which historians have generally and not unjustly called "The Dark Ages."

In the first place, we may notice the frequency of apostasy. Tribal conversion too often meant tribal apostasy; when a chief reverted to heathenism his people were apt to follow him. Among the Saxons in the eighth century, and again in England and elsewhere, we read of violent uprisings, of the destruction of Christian Churches, and of the restoration of heathen rites.[1] Again, we have constant

[1] Instances of apostasy in England have already been given on pp. 143, 144. For instances among the Saxons, see Hodgkin, *Charles the Great*, p. 119, and Neander, *Church History*, v. p. 104 f. The life of Sturm, Abbot of Fulda, would supply other illustrations. Numerous instances of its frequency among different barbarian tribes may be found in Hardwick, *Church History* (*Middle Age*), chs. i., v., ix., xiii.

In estimating the significance of this tendency to tribal apostasy we must, of course, weigh the fact that in primitive society the tribe counts for more than the individual; but Christianity had brought to light the value of the individual, and it is just this principle which the Church of these centuries failed to enforce (see Plummer's note on Bede, *Hist Eccl.* ii. 14).

evidence of the persistence of heathen traditions and customs and ceremonies inside the Church. The Capitularies of Charles the Great, and the enactments of Councils, such as that of Lestines (743), reveal and condemn a great number of such practices, among which we find sacrifices at tombs and on rocks, sacrifices to Mercury and Woden, the offering of models of hands and feet, the use of honey cakes, and many different forms of charms and incantations.[1] Nothing, indeed, was more persistent than the survival of magic. The Church, it is true, always denounced it, but, unfortunately, instead of condemning it as an empty superstition, she believed in its reality, and attributed its effects to diabolic agency, a view which eventually led to persecution and torture on a scale which was truly appalling.[2]

Far more serious, however, than the cases of apostasy or the retention of heathen customs was

[1] The *indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum* drawn up at the Council of Lestines contains a list of thirty prevalent pagan practices. See Labbé, *Concilia*, vol. vi. p. 1337, and cp. *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* s.v. "Paganism." In the year before Lestines, the fifth canon of the Council of Clovesho had condemned various "paganiae," including auguries, divinations, incantations, and profane sacrifices, which were performed "juxta ecclesias . . . sub nomine sanctorum martyrum vel confessorum" (Labbé, *op. cit.* vi. p. 1335). Prohibitions abound in the *Capitularies* of Charles the Great, *e.g.* Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, vol. xcvii. c. 147, 171, 205, 239, 248.

[2] Lecky, *Rationalism*, i. pp. 6-8. The whole of the lengthy first chapter of this work is devoted to the history of magic and witchcraft, and it would be difficult to find more painful reading anywhere.

the "paganisation" of the doctrines and practices of Christianity itself. To quote Mr. Lecky's words, which, I think, are hardly exaggerated: "Vast tribes of savages who had always been idolaters, who were perfectly incapable, from their low state of civilisation, of forming any but anthropomorphic conceptions of the Deity . . . and who for the most part were converted, not by individual persuasion, but by the commands of their chiefs, embraced Christianity in such multitudes that their habits of mind soon became the dominating habits of the Church."[1] To this cause we may ascribe much that is most superstitious and most unworthy in the Church of the Dark Ages: a low, anthropomorphic view of God; a growing system of saint- and image-worship which was practically polytheistic, and against which iconoclasm was a frequent but ineffectual protest; a grotesque credulity about miracles and prodigies; the treatment of the Sacraments as fetishes or charms, sometimes almost as a rival system to heathen magic; the belief in the intrinsic merit of ceremonies; the substitution of bare dogma and formalism for spiritual and moral requirements; the materialisation of all beliefs, especially those with regard to heaven and hell; and the establishment of a system of spiritual terrorism. For some centuries it almost seemed as if fear had cast out love. The whole religious atmosphere was charged with superstition and terror. The precepts of Christ were too often forgotten, and the literalism of the

[1] Lecky, *op. cit.* vol. i. pp. 238-39.

Levitical code was remembered.[1] And with the degradation of belief and worship we naturally find a lowering of the moral standards of Christianity. The substitution of fear as the religious motive, and the prevalence of an unworthy view of God and of a mechanical view of salvation, produced their inevitable result in the loss of ideas and principles and virtues which were essentially Christian. Mendacity and cruelty abounded; sexual sins of the blackest kind stained the lives not only of kings and courtiers, but of ecclesiastics. Orthodoxy of belief and regularity of external observance became the tests which were applied to men's lives and characters, and the plainest commandments of God were obscured by being overlaid with the traditions of men.

It can hardly be denied that the evils which have just been described existed on a vast scale, and that, if they were not wholly due to the too rapid absorption of classical paganism and barbarian heathendom into the Church, they were at least greatly accentuated by it. If anti-Christian writers, as they survey the condition of mankind of these centuries, are able to apply the contemptuous words of the great Latin poet of unbelief, "Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum," it is to this influence more than any other that the justification of the taunt is due.[2] We must not, of course, forget that there

[1] For evidence of the influence of Old Testament precedents upon persecution, see Appendix, Note D, p. 383.

[2] Lucretius, *De Natura Rerum*, i., of the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and compare i. 63 f., iii. 37. No ancient poet or philosopher was

was a brighter side. History is apt to busy herself mainly in recording wars and crimes and scandals, and to overlook the tranquil lives of holy and humble men. The Church never lacked great missionaries, and within the walls of the monasteries there were always men of real piety who had fled from the vice and the cruelty of the world and from the secularisation of the Church. Nor were saints to be found only among the clergy. We find Alfred the Great upon a throne, the fairest specimen, perhaps, of Christian character that these centuries produced. Nor was the witness of the Church ever wholly silent against the prevailing wickedness. She built up a system of discipline; the Penitential Books and the decrees of Councils give evidence of the persistence with which she struggled to enforce her moral code, although in a mechanical and quantitative way, and with only a limited success.[1] Her

so "modern" as Lucretius in his hatred of superstition as "the great curse of life." "Every line of the poem," writes Professor Sellar (*Roman Poets of the Republic*, p. 291), "is indirectly a protest against the religious errors of antiquity." It is noteworthy that the passage i. 63 f. is quoted by Bayle in *La France toute catholique*, *ad in.*

[1] "Penitentials" represent the answers ascribed to bishops or other ecclesiastics on points of penitential discipline. Thus in England there were the Penitentials ascribed to Archbishop Theodore, Bede, and Egbert (printed in full in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, etc., vol. iii. Cp. Bright, *Early English Church History*, ch. xi.). Both in England and on the Continent the Penitentials often bear witness to the utter disregard of elementary rules of Christian morality, but at least they held up a higher ideal. The same may be said of the decrees of local or provincial Councils,

bishops, with all their faults, were, as Dean Church says, "the only trusted guides of life," "representative, not of religion only and the claims of God, but of moral order, of the rights of conscience and the sympathies of men, of the bonds and authority of human society."[1] Christianity raised the barbarians, though "it suffered itself in the effort." It saved much that was best in the old Roman civilisation, it humanised the barbarian codes of law, and appealed to the imaginations of men by the spectacle of its great and powerful organisation, its unity, and its uncompromising claim to a more than human authority.

This aspect of things must never be overlooked if we are to arrive at any fair judgment of the action of the Church in these troubled times. Yet, when all has been said, we may be of opinion that the gain was a gain to civilisation rather than to religion, to the World rather than to the Church; and indeed the World is often only too glad that the Church should serve her in the capacity of moral policeman. The object of our inquiry (it must be repeated) is not to acquit or to condemn individuals, but to form an estimate of a policy and a system. We have simply to ask whether the principles which the Church adopted with regard to the conversion of the barbarians were or were not those of her Master, and whether

and of the minutely detailed legislation of Charles the Great in his *Capitularies*. See, for instance, *Capit. Ecclesiasticum* and *Capit. Aquisgranense* (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. xcvii. col. 151-184, 223-232).

[1] Church, *Middle Ages*, pp. 59, 61.

the effects which they produced, either immediate or more remote, were such as to justify or to excuse their adoption. I am aware that there are many historians to whom there seems to be a certain crudeness, perhaps almost a Philistinism of outlook, in attempting to ask and to answer such questions. There is a kind of fatalism or determinism which it is fashionable to apply to history, and which would dismiss such questions by saying that things were bound to develop as they did, and to happen in the way in which they did happen, and in no other; which argues that it was necessary that barbarian races should be treated as children, not as grown men; that Christianity could not have survived or spread in any other manner; and that toleration is a modern development which it would be absurd to look for in an early stage of the history of civilisation.[1] It seems impossible,

[1] Cp. Lord Acton, *History of Freedom*, p. 250: "Persecution comes naturally in a certain period of the progress of society, before a more flexible and comprehensive system has been introduced by that advance of religion and civilisation whereby Catholicism gradually penetrates into hostile countries and Christian powers acquire dominion over infidel populations." Such views are rightly criticised by Bishop Creighton, *Persecution and Tolerance*, p. 85: "It is enough to say that the Church receives from her Master no power to exercise any such coercive discipline: so far as she did so she acted as part of the world-power, and must be judged accordingly." Sohm (*Outlines of Church History*, Eng. trans. p. 20) seems to take a merely fatalistic view of the *secularisation* of the Church. "This state of things was inevitable if the Church was to fulfil her high calling, to win the world over to herself."

however, to get rid of the question in this easy fashion. We have seen that the teaching and example of Christ with regard to such questions as the freedom of the individual conscience, the necessity of real individual conviction as a condition of discipleship, and the separateness of the Divine Society from the World, were emphatic and unambiguous. These principles of her Master were recognised by the Church of the first three centuries. It is true that during that period the Church was compelled to suffer violence and had no opportunity of inflicting it; but the whole spirit of Ante-Nicene Christianity may be said to have been on the side of liberty, and absolute religious liberty was the acknowledged principle of the Edict of Milan. Then, in the fourth century, the great change begins, and secular means are employed for the suppression of heresy and the wholesale inclusion, first of civilised pagans, and afterwards of the barbarians, within the fold of the Church. We ask the reason for so striking an abandonment of essential principles, and historians are not agreed as to the answer. Lord Acton tells us that "external circumstances forced intolerance upon her, after her spirit of unity had triumphed, in spite both of the freedom she proclaimed and of the persecutions she had suffered."[1]

[1] Lord Acton, *History of Freedom*, p. 186. Lord Acton draws a clear distinction between the Catholic theory of intolerance and the Protestant theory, of which something will be said in lecture vi., Appendix, Note B, p. 391.

Mr. Lecky would find the main cause in the doctrine of exclusive salvation, which the Church now riveted upon mankind, and which made it natural to believe that persecution was justified in the true interests of the persecuted, *pro salute animae*.[1] This view is somewhat lightly dismissed by Bishop Creighton, who, after declaring with perfect truth that persecution was plainly contrary to Christ's teaching and alien to the whole spirit of Christianity, and that the Church adopted the system from the World, maintains the more disputable *theses* that she always applied it for political rather than religious ends, and also that the system was always condemned by the Christian conscience and did not originate in any misunderstanding of the Scriptures.[2] I do not

[1] Lecky, *Rationalism*, ii. pp. 1-2. H. C. Lea (*History of the Inquisition*, i. 209 f.) attributes persecution mainly to zeal for orthodoxy and the *odium theologicum*, but also to love of power, wealth, and authority on the part of the Church.

[2] Bishop Creighton (*Persecution and Tolerance*, p. 4 f.), criticising Mr. Lecky's view, maintains that if the motive of persecution had been the overpowering sense of exclusive salvation within the Church, the whole history of Christianity would have been different. But can it be denied that the idea of exclusive salvation was the predominant motive in the mind of St. Augustine and of most Christian theologians after him? As to the objections which Bishop Creighton urges against Mr. Lecky's view, viz. (1) that Christianity did not spread its dominion by the sword, and (2) that within the limits of Christendom itself coercion was not employed against those who were not Christians, it can only be said that neither of these statements is true. The instances of forcible evangelisation which have been given in the preceding pages are a sufficient disproof of the former, and the forcible suppression of open paganism and of lingering pagan

think that it would affect my main argument if Bishop Creighton's theory were sound, and I wish that I could agree with it. I state my dissent from so eminent a historian with diffidence; but the weight of evidence seems to me to be distinctly on the other side. It appears to me that mistaken exegesis of the Scriptures, and, in particular, the undue weight given to Old Testament texts and precedents, literally applied, was largely responsible for the adoption of a coercive policy; and, further, that for centuries the instances in which this policy was condemned by the Christian conscience were comparatively rare.[1] The policy was, in a sense,

practices inside Christendom of the latter. The exceptional treatment which was *sometimes* accorded to Jews and Saracens seems to me to be the sole objection which has any weight.

It is not argued in these pages that the doctrine of exclusive salvation was the *sole* cause of persecution, but only that it was the chief cause. The Church had allied itself to the World, and the civil power found political reasons for persecution in addition to the theological reason.

[1] The protests of Alcuin and Lull have already been quoted (pp. 149, 150), and other instances could no doubt be adduced, but they would be few in comparison with the general policy of acquiescence in coercion of heretics by the civil power, and in the forcible evangelisation of the heathen. It is true that St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologiae*, 2^a 2^{ae}, *Quaest.* x. 8-12) distinguishes the case of heretics and apostates, who are under obligations towards the Church, from that of Jews and heathens who have never professed to belong to it, and declares that the latter are not to be coerced into belief, while the former ought to be. Even the Jews, however, he regarded as "servi ecclesiae," and their property as liable to confiscation. As to the heathen, it is not plain that he disapproved of wholesale con-

adopted from the system of the world. Emperors such as Theodosius and Justinian and Charles the Great were only too ready to enforce conformity by civil sanctions, and to confound the functions of Church and State; but the temptation which they thus placed before the Church met with little or no resistance. The Church never met it in the spirit in which her Master rejected the temptation to gain "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." On the contrary she accepted the situation with little or no demur. And can it be said with truth that she exercised this policy for political rather than for religious ends? The supposed glory of God, the extension and influence of the Church, the salvation of souls, which (so it was then believed) must otherwise inevitably and eternally be lost,—these surely were among the principal motives for her action. Nor were these motives in themselves other than laudable. The Church was, in fact, anxious to establish prematurely a world-wide Theocracy, and fancied that she saw the means of doing this through an alliance with a World which now professed friendship instead of hostility. She was mistaken in thinking that any form of Theocracy, such as this alliance would establish, could be the kingdom which Christ had intended to set up; and she was led into the

version, though his words exclude the policy of the sword, as adopted by Charlemagne. After the twelfth century there was a revival of zeal for persecution, which had been only intermittent in the preceding period.

mistake because she had been affected by the spirit of the world, and had become blind to the simplest and most fundamental principles of her Master's teaching. Had she remembered and realised the full import of His saying, "My kingdom is not of this world"; had she been mindful of the stern test which He always laid down for discipleship; had she regarded the method which He himself consistently pursued, the course of her history would have been very different, and the foundations of Christendom would have been more securely, though far more slowly, laid. "He that believeth shall not make haste"—the haste of the Church was a measure of the imperfection of her faith. As it was, she chose the less worthy part, and for centuries afterwards "the wrath of man" tried in vain to "work the righteousness of God." The results were seen in bloodthirsty persecutions, in the prevalence of a hollow and nominal Christianity, in the hopeless and persistent confusion between the secular and the spiritual provinces. Who will be bold enough to deny that we are even now experiencing the results of the Church's mistake in the inconsistent, ineffective, devitalised religion of our own day, not less than in the permanent alienation from Christianity of large numbers of men who see in the Church only the age-long enemy of Freedom and of Truth?[1] By painful experience we have regained, or we are regaining—

[1] For religious intolerance as a cause of anti-Christian feeling, see Appendix, Note E, p. 385.

for even yet the process is hardly complete—the fundamental truth that Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and that the Church and the World (and therefore the Church and every civil State) are distinct societies with distinct ends and distinct methods. But for many centuries that truth was obscured and forgotten; and it would indeed be a strange exception to the working of the laws of the Divine Order if that inveterate neglect of a primary principle had failed to bring upon the Church a far-reaching Nemesis and a long-enduring loss.

LECTURE V

THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE

Unless to Peter's chair the viewless wind
Must come and ask permission where to blow,
What further empire would it have? For now
A ghostly domination, unconfined
As that by dreaming bards to love assigned,
Sits there in sober truth—to raise the low,
Perplex the wise, the strong to overthrow,
Through earth and heaven to bind and to unbind!

WORDSWORTH, *Ecclesiastical Sketches*, Part II.

V

THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE

St. Mark x. 42-45: "But Jesus called them to him and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

Jesus Christ could be stern as well as loving, and in the training of His disciples He did not scruple to rebuke with extreme severity even those whom He admitted to His closest intimacy. No disciple incurred His rebukes so often as Simon Peter, the Rock-man upon whom He designed to build His Church; on two notable occasions also the sons of Zebedee are recorded to have provoked His wrath. St. Luke narrates how the sons of Thunder desired to punish an inhospitable Samaritan village by calling down fire from heaven. "But He turned and rebuked them." The words which follow, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of," seem not to belong to the original text of the third

Gospel; but they are early, and not improbably they preserve a trustworthy tradition of our Lord's actual rebuke. They are perfectly consonant with the language used by Him on other occasions. He is reproving the worldly temper, the temper which impatiently resorts to worldly weapons, and does not distinguish between the spiritual method and the carnal.[1] So it was also on the occasion described in the text. The sons of Zebedee had come to ask for the places on the right hand and on the left in Christ's glory. Christ told them that they knew not what they asked, and that instead of places in glory they must look forward to sharing the cup which their Master would drink of and the baptism with which He was to be baptised. And then He proceeds to rebuke the jealous indignation of the ten remaining Apostles, which had been stirred by the request of the two brothers for precedence. This ambition, this desire for honour and lordship, was unspiritual: it was secular and heathen, a temper to be expected in the worldly rulers of the Gentiles, but alien to the instruments of a spiritual kingdom. Not lordship but ministry, not precedence but service, was to be the motive of the followers of the Son of Man. With what fatal completeness this Divine commandment was afterwards obscured by the traditions of men we shall see in the present lecture.

On previous occasions we have endeavoured to

[1] St. Luke ix. 52-56; see note *ad loc.* in Dr. Plummer's *Commentary*. Cp. Creighton, *Persecution and Tolerance*, pp. 13-14.

trace, first, Christ's original intentions for the Visible Society which He founded; then the growth of that Society in its early stage of suffering and persecution; then its alliance with the World and the World-power, and its external triumph over Greco-Roman paganism; and, lastly, the process by which it absorbed the barbarian races which had spread over Europe. By the time of Theodosius, still more by the time of Justinian or of Charles the Great, the Church had travelled a long way from her original methods and her original position. She had completely abandoned the *intensive* policy, and had embarked upon a policy of *extension*. She had made it her aim to become co-extensive with the World, and that not as a far-off ultimate ideal, but as an immediate object. For the discharge of her task she thought it legitimate to enlist the favour and support of the civil power, and to make Christian discipleship a matter of civil obligation. She also found it necessary to develop her internal organisation, and it was convenient to do so on lines which followed, in the main, the civil organisation of the Roman Empire. The *civitas* had its bishop; the *provincia* its metropolitan; the patriarchates were roughly analogous to the imperial "dioceses" of the Empire, or to the later *regna*.[1]

[1] It was laid down in the 9th canon of the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 341) that the bishop of a metropolis or civil capital should have precedence and charge of the whole province (Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, ii. p. 69). Cp. Sohm, *Outlines of Church History* (English trans., p. 47). "The city (*civitas*) was the lowest political unit of the Empire. It became the lowest

It was not unnatural that the question should arise whether, just as the civil organisation culminated in the Roman Emperor, so the ecclesiastical organisation ought not to culminate in the supremacy of one of the great Patriarchs over the whole Catholic Church. The elaboration of the theory of unity under one visible earthly head was the work of the later centuries, but the demand for some effective unity first arose as a practical question. Effective unity of government and discipline was a necessity for the Church, first in her struggle against the

political unit of the Church [*i.e.* the episcopal diocese]. . . . In the constitution of the Empire the province, with the provincial governor, stood above the *civitas*. The episcopal dioceses were united in like manner under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan, the bishop of a provincial capital, forming an ecclesiastical province. In the constitution of the Empire, from the fourth century, several provinces composed an imperial diocese under an imperial governor (*vicarius*). The imperial diocese also (at least in certain parts of the Eastern Greek Church) formed, after the fourth century, part of the ecclesiastical constitution, as the district of a patriarch, to whom the metropolitans of the imperial dioceses were subordinate. Finally, the general union of the Churches corresponded to the general union of the Empire, with the imperial Council (the so-called Ecumenical Council) as its legitimate organ. The Church of the universal Empire was a compact unity, an outwardly visible and august embodiment of universal Christendom."

The three patriarchates recognised at Nicaea were Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. Constantinople was recognised as second only to Rome by the Council held there in 381, and the patriarchate of Palestine was assigned to Jerusalem at Chalcedon in 461 (Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, i. p. 389 f., ii. 357, iii. 355; Sohm, *op. cit.* p. 58).

Empire, then in her conflict with Arianism and other heresies, and, finally, to an even greater degree, when, amidst the ruins of the Western Empire and the confusion of the barbarian invasions, she alone could stand erect and exhibit to the world the hope of settled order and spiritual progress.[1] Could this effective unity be found anywhere except in the supremacy of a single bishop? and, if not, to which see was this supremacy to belong? These were the great questions which the Church had to solve in the period which followed the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire. It would be wholly impossible to trace in any detail the numerous stages and the innumerable incidents of the process of solution. We can but observe a few of the principal causes which contributed to the development of the Roman Papacy, and which led Western Christendom to find at once the expression and the safeguard of its unity in the See of Rome.

First, however, a word may be said as to the earlier of the two questions. Granted the need of unity, what other means of attaining it were open to the Church? One conceivable (though not defensible) method would have been to secure it through the imperial power; and, indeed, in the fourth and fifth centuries we meet with many instances of imperial intervention in matters of faith and discipline. Catholic and Arian in turn were not unwilling to welcome the intervention of the Emperor—provided that the Emperor was on their

[1] Sohm, *op. cit.* p. 78; Dean Church, *Middle Ages*, ch. iii.

side. It was by the order of the Emperor Maximus that Priscillian was burnt.[1] It was by an imperial edict that Pelagianism was condemned, when Pope Zosimus had acquitted its adherents.[2] In the East, the *Henoticon* of the Emperor Zeno in 482 was only one of several examples of direct imperial intervention in matters of doctrine on the part of the Byzantine Court.[3] The reign of Justinian would afford other illustrations. But even in the more servile East such a claim did not pass unchallenged; and in the West, in spite of the willingness of the Church to lean upon the civil power, this development of imperial control was repudiated by men like Hosius, Ambrose, and Lucifer of Cagliari.[4]

[1] See above, pp. 122, 151. The whole story is given at length by Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 46-51.

[2] The Emperor Honorius, by a rescript of 418, banished Pelagius, Caelestius, and their adherents, who had just been acquitted by Zosimus. Zosimus subsequently condemned the heresy. See *Dict. Christ. Biogr.* s.v. "Zosimus, Pope"; and cp. the extant letters of Zosimus (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* vol. xx.).

[3] The Henoticon was issued by Zeno with the approval of the Patriarch Acacius, by whom probably it was drawn up; but it was issued on the *authority* of the Emperor alone, and was resented on this ground by a certain party (Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 14; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* vol. i. book iii. ch. 1; Gibbon, ch. xlvii.).

[4] Athanasius (*Hist. Arianorum*, § 44) preserves an outspoken letter of Hosius to the Emperor Constantius, in the course of which he writes "σοὶ βασιλείαν ὁ Θεὸς ἐνεχείρισεν· ἡμῖν τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπίστευσε," and quotes the text "Render unto Caesar," etc.

Ambrose (*Epist.* 21), after discussing the same text, writes (§§ 35, 36) "Ecclesia Dei est, Caesari utique non debet addici, quia jus Caesaris esse non potest Dei templum . . . Quid enim

When the Western Empire fell, and the power of the Emperor who reigned at Constantinople became a mere shadow to his nominal subjects in Italy or Gaul, the idea of achieving ecclesiastical unity by direct imperial control passed out of the region of possibility.

A second means of securing unity might seem to be provided by the action of General Councils. The first General Council assembled within a few years of the imperial toleration of Christianity, and we know how the precedent of Nicaea was followed at Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. These Councils accomplished, in the providence of God, a work of incalculable value in safeguarding the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. Yet no one can read the accounts of their proceedings without perceiving their utter inadequacy as a means of securing peace and unity in the existing moral and spiritual state of the Church and the

honorificentius quam ut imperator Ecclesiae filius esse dicatur? quod cum dicitur, sine peccato dicitur, cum gratia dicitur 'Imperator enim intra Ecclesiam, non supra Ecclesiam, est.'" Ambrose's conduct, when he refused the Eucharist to Theodosius (*Epist.* 51) and declined to surrender churches to Arians (*Epist.* 20, 21), was consistent with his theoretical limitation of the imperial authority.

Lucifer, of Cagliari in Sardinia, incurred banishment for his defiance of Constantius, and was regarded by St. Ambrose and St. Augustine as having fallen into schism. His extant writings (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* vol. xiii.) show the extent of his resistance to the intervention of the Emperor on the side of the Arians. (These references are mainly due to Mr. A. J. Carlyle's *Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, i. ch. xv.)

episcopate. The description given by Gregory of Nazianzus of his fellow-bishops at the Council of Constantinople is hardly quotable. "Gluttons," "liars," "villains," "time-servers"—these are only a few of his epithets. He sums up his experience of Councils in these words: "Of no Synod have I seen a profitable end, but rather an addition to than a diminution of evils: for the love of strife and the thirst for superiority are beyond the power of words to express."[1] In the next century the Council of Ephesus, over which Cyril of Alexandria presided, was a scene of turbulence, violence, and all uncharitableness; and the "Robber Synod" which followed it fully deserves its nickname. Cardinal Newman, although he endeavours to palliate Cyril's conduct, describes the proceedings of these two Councils as "atrocious" and "scandals," and writes with regret of the tone and temper which prevailed in these and other Councils of the period.[2] Even

[1] Gregory Nazianzen, *Carm.* II. xi. (*De vita sua*), xii. (*De se ipso*), xiii. (*Ad episcopos*), and xvii. (*De diversis vitae generibus et adv. falsos episcopos*). Some extracts are given in Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, lect. xvi., but these four poems should be read in full to give an adequate idea of Gregory's invective. See especially the passages beginning xiii. 75 (δεῦρ' ἴθ' ὅσοι κακίης ἐπιβήτορες, αἴσχεα φωτῶν), xiii. 200, and xvii. 91 (οὐδέ τί που συνόδοισιν ὁμόθρονος ἔσσυμ' ἔγωγε), and cp. Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, ch. xvi.

[2] For the Council of Ephesus (431) and the "Latrocinium" of 449, cp. Salmon, *op. cit.*, lecture xvii. Dr. Salmon's verdict on the action and character of Cyril of Alexandria is not too severe—"perhaps of all those who have been honoured with the title of saint, the one whose character least commands our

had their temper been more Christian, the vast distances which many bishops had to travel in order to attend them made a fair representation of all parts of the Church impossible; nor could General Councils be assembled frequently enough to act as a regular Parliament of the Church. Further, the operation of their decrees depended on their acceptance by different parts of the Church. This acceptance was not always forthcoming. We know, for instance, that the elevation of the Bishop of Constantinople by the Council of Chalcedon to a position which seemed to endanger the primacy of Rome was ignored by Leo the Great and the whole of the Western Church.[1] Thus the conditions of successful conciliar action were absent, and the jealousies between the great Patriarchs were too strong to make their co-operation on equal terms the means of securing effective unity. It was the unspirituality of the Church, the worldly temper, the prevalent jealousy and violence, which really created the demand for a centralised supremacy.

Many separate causes combined to determine the question of supremacy in favour of the Roman See:—

(1) We noticed even during the Ante-Nicene

affection." . . . "His whole career was marked by violence and bloodshed." Cp. Newman, *Historical Sketches*, iii. 338-362, and Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, vol. iii.

[1] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. i. book ii. ch. iv.; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, iii. pp. 433 f. Leo I. approved the doctrinal decree of Chalcedon, but rejected the 28th canon as to the precedence of the See of Constantinople.

period that a "primacy of honour" was widely accorded to the Bishop of Rome, a primacy which the more aggressive popes (for instance Victor, who in 196 excommunicated the Quartodecimans in Asia) endeavoured to convert into something more definite and more authoritative. The chief cause of the pre-eminence allowed to the Roman See lay in the prestige of the imperial city and in its central position as a meeting-place of Christians. Thus Irenaeus says that, on account of Rome's position as the capital, the faithful everywhere must necessarily resort thither, and it was natural that these Christians from other Churches should attach a special weight to the tradition of the Roman Church, beyond even that of the Church at Alexandria, or Antioch, or Jerusalem.[1]

(2) This pre-eminence of the Bishops of Rome was not weakened (as might, perhaps, have been expected) but greatly strengthened by the foundation of Constantinople and the abandonment of Rome by the Imperial Court. The "Donation of Constantine" is a later historical fiction, but it is a fiction which embodied a residuum of truth. The result of the self-imposed absence of the emperors

[1] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haereses*, iii. 3 "ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter potiorem (*a.l.* potentiorem) principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam (hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles), in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio." For the interpretation of this passage, and especially the sense of *convenire ad*, cp. Salmon, *Infallibility*, lecture xx.; Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, ch. vi.; Puller, *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, lecture i.

from Rome was to increase the power of the popes. Dante's famous line, "per cedere al Pastor si fece Greco," describes the effect, though not indeed the intention, of Constantine's action.[1] When Rome ceased to be the seat of the court and of the civil government, the Bishop of Rome became the most important representative personage in Italy and in the West. In 476 the Western line of Emperors came to an end, and it was more than 300 years before the Western Empire was revived in another shape. Save for a few isolated episodes, such as the victories of Belisarius, the supremacy of the Emperor at Constantinople hardly made itself felt in the West,[2] and in ecclesiastical matters the New Rome tried in vain to assert its equality with the Old. One cause of its failure was that the Bishops of Constantinople had to live at close quarters with Emperors who constantly intervened in the government of the Church, and the Church of the East

[1] Dante, *Paradiso*, xx. 57, "To yield the Shepherd room, passed o'er to Greece" (Cary's translation). The Donation of Constantine was fabricated about the middle of the eighth century (Duchesne, *Temporal Sovereignty of Popes*, English trans. p. 120). The forged document transfers to the Pope not only Rome, but "omnes Italiae seu occidentalium regionum provincias, loca et civitates," and asserts that Constantine founded his new capital because it was unfitting for an earthly emperor to hold sway "ubi principatus sacerdotum et Christianae religonis caput ab Imperatore caelesti constitutum est." Cp. Gieseler, *Church History*, ii. 118; Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. vii., and Addit. Note 4.

[2] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. iii.; Church, *Middle Ages*, ch. ii.

sank more and more into an Erastian servitude Moreover, from the seventh century onward, the Eastern Church was weakened by the continuous advance of Islam. In the West the Pope enjoyed greater freedom. In Rome and throughout Italy he was looked to as the most important leader, the representative of Christian civilisation; even in the flush of conquest the barbarians showed towards the Papacy the same veneration which they displayed towards the Empire. After the sack of Rome Innocent I. stood forth as the real ruler of the capital; forty years later Leo the Great was accounted to have saved Rome from the sword of Attila. Before the death of Gregory the Great this position of prestige and leadership was undisputed.[1]

(3) So far the causes of the growth of the Papacy may be called civil rather than ecclesiastical or theological. Nor can we ignore the personal

[1] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book iii. ch. i. (Innocent I.), ch. vii. (Gregory the Great); Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, i. p. 58 f., ii. p. 276.

For the subjection of the Eastern Church to imperial control, cp. Adeney, *Greek and Eastern Churches*, p. 233. "She was tied hands and feet by the imperial will. Emperors and empresses appointed and deposed patriarchs and bishops. The Byzantine Church was being converted into a department of the highly organised bureaucratic Byzantine Empire."

I must plead guilty to neglecting to trace the fortunes of the Church in the East after the time of Justinian. This is due alike to lack of adequate knowledge, to lack of space, and to the fact that English Christianity is more concerned with the West. But I believe that the argument of these lectures could be equally supported by illustrations drawn from the East.

element. The growth of the papal power was largely due to the abilities, the ambitions, and even the virtues of a few great men. Popes like Innocent I., Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, and in later times Nicolas I., Innocent III., and Gregory VII. were men of real force and character; nor were the successive advances which they secured for the Roman See forfeited by the weaknesses or the crimes of the less worthy and less distinguished popes. The influence of the popes, moreover, was generally exerted upon the orthodox side, and although the remembrance of names of Callistus, Liberius, Zosimus, Vigilius, and Honorius ought to be sufficient to refute any theory of papal immunity from error, the part which the Bishops of Rome had played in the struggle with Arianism and other less formidable heresies was remembered to their credit by Catholic Christendom.[1]

(4) We have not yet mentioned the cause upon which papalist writers laid increasing emphasis as time went on—the claim of the Bishop of Rome to

[1] For the case of the popes who fell into error, see Salmon, *Infallibility*, lecture xxii.; Puller, *Primitive Saints*, lectures iv., v., xii.

For the prestige which Rome gained through her orthodoxy when the East was disturbed by the great heresies about the person of Christ, see Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, ch. vii.: "Though the Roman Church was not a great theological centre, . . . she was endowed with a splendid capacity for 'holding the tradition' with unswerving orthodoxy. The consequent enhancement of her general ecclesiastical reputation coincided with the deeper sense of the need of a recognised centre to Western Christendom which finds expression in the canon of Sardica."

universal supremacy, as being the successor of St. Peter, and, in virtue of the promise made to St. Peter, the Vicar of Christ upon earth. We are not now discussing the validity of those claims so much as the share which they had in establishing the papal power. We shall return to them presently in their fully developed form in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. During the first four centuries the power and prestige of the Roman See were no doubt enhanced by its traditional connection with St. Peter, and when the Council of Sardica allowed appeals to Rome, it spoke of honouring the memory of the Apostle Peter.[1] But the privilege thus conferred fell far short of the recognition of the later claims, and the emphatic repudiation by Gregory the Great of the title of "universal bishop" as blasphemous and tending to vanity and strife, is a clear proof that even to the great man who did more perhaps than any other Pope to strengthen the See of Rome the full development of the Petrine claims was unknown. As a matter of history, the recognition of the claim to universal jurisdiction was mainly due to the acceptance in the ninth century of the Forged Decretals, on which the huge edifice of the mediaeval Canon Law was based. Nor does

[1] See canon 3 of the Council of Sardica (Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, ii. 112), "Si vobis placet, Sancti Petri apostoli memoriam honoremus, et scribatur ab his, qui causam examinaverunt, Julio Romano episcopo, et si judicaverit renovandum esse judicium, renovetur et det judices," etc.; also canons 4 and 5. The subsequent attempt to pass off the canons of Sardica as Nicene is described by Salmon, *op. cit.* lecture xxi.

this gigantic forgery stand alone. The Donation of Constantine was a fiction scarcely less remarkable than the Decretals, and it was of immense importance both in augmenting the spiritual prestige of the popes and in securing their temporal sovereignty over a large portion of Italy.[1]

(5) One more cause which favoured the growth of the Papacy may be briefly noticed—the championship of the papal claims by the monastic orders. A large proportion of the vigour and the devotion —not to say the fanaticism—of the Church was to be found inside the monastic orders in the days of their prosperity, and their influence was generally exerted on the side of Rome. They were freed from episcopal control and placed in direct relation with the Roman See, and their feeling was less

[1] For the title of "Universal Bishop" and its repudiation by Gregory, see Gregory, *Epist.* viii. 30 (to Eulogius) "recedant verba quae vanitatem inflant et caritatem vulnerant." Some preceding words, "meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiae," are misapplied in the 3rd Vatican decree. Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, ch. vii.; cp. Salmon, *Infallibility*, pp. 423, 487; Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, ii. pp. 209 f.

For the Forged Decretals, cp. Gieseler, *Church History*, ii. pp. 109 f., and Salmon, *Infallibility*, pp. 449 f. Nicolas I. at once made use of the forgeries in his controversies with Hincmar and Photius (858-867). The "Decretum" of Gratian quotes hundreds of these spurious decretals. For the Donation of Constantine, see *supra*, p. 179. Great stress was laid on it by papalist writers like Augustinus Triumphus and Alvarus Pelagius, though the latter records the story that when it was made angel voices were heard saying "Hodie in ecclesia effusum est venenum" (*De planctu Ecclesiae*, ch. xl.).

national and more cosmopolitan — more "ultramontane"—than that of the secular clergy.[1]

Such were some of the causes which account for the rise of the papal power. Its development was not, of course, unchecked or unopposed. Here and there a prelate of independent character and strong personal influence, such as Hincmar of Rheims, carried on an obstinate struggle against an aggressive pope.[2] Frequently a monarch, such as Lothair, resented papal interference with his kingdom or his private life.[3] Again and again, in the centuries preceding the Reformation, the growth of national feeling led, as in England, to a strong resistance being offered to the more corrupt or more extravagant demands of papal authority. But the greatest struggles of the Papacy were directed against the institution which stands out as both linked and contrasted with it in mediaeval thought, the Holy Roman Empire; and before we estimate the papal

[1] "Monasticism ascended the Papal throne in the person of Gregory" (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, bk. iii. ch. vii.). Gregory began the regulation of the relations between the monasteries and the diocesan bishops on the one hand and the secular clergy on the other; and the later emancipation of the monks from episcopal control and their direct connection with the Papacy grew out of this beginning. Cp. Dudden, *op. cit.* ii. pp. 188 f.

[2] Hincmar refused to break off communion with Charles the Bald, boldly rebuked Hadrian II. for his invasion of his metropolitan rights, and defied his threats with the answer "Si excommunicaturus venerit, excommunicatus abibit" (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book v. ch. v.).

[3] Lothair, who "was as dastardly as lustful," eventually repented and submitted (Milman, *op. cit.*, *ibid.*).

claims at their highest point of development in the fourteenth century we must glance at the history of the Empire and its place in Christendom.

Under the pagan emperors from Augustus to Diocletian the Roman Empire was regarded as an undivided universal dominion over the whole civilised world, exercised by a single individual.[1] A great system of imperial worship had been established and accepted; and so vast and impressive was the dominion of Rome that men regarded it as necessarily eternal. It is essential to remember these facts if we are to understand the mediaeval Empire. It is true that Diocletian found it convenient to apportion the imperial functions among *Augusti* and *Caesares*, but in theory the Empire remained one. Constantine became sole ruler: so again did Theodosius. After him there were separate lines in the East and the West; and in 476, after a succession of weak and worthless rulers, the barbarian Odoacer extinguished the Western imperial line, and sent to the Eastern Emperor the insignia which he dared not grasp for himself.[2] In

[1] Under the earlier emperors the semblance of republican forms and senatorial government was kept up at Rome, but in the provinces these republican forms had never been known, and by the time of Septimius Severus "the Emperor stood forth to the whole Roman world as the single centre and source of power and political action" (Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. ii.). Diocletian's subdivision was due to military considerations in view of the pressure of the barbarians on different parts of the Empire (Gibbon, ch. xiii.).

[2] Bryce, *op. cit.* ch. iii.; Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, iii. p. 161.

strict theory it may be inaccurate to say that the Western Empire ended with Romulus Augustulus.[1] The Eastern Emperors claimed jurisdiction over the West as well as the East, and Justinian vindicated his authority, The barbarians, moreover—such is the power of ideas and institutions—venerated the imperial name and system even when they defied imperial edicts or overran imperial territories. "It is hardly too much to say that the thought of antagonism to the Empire and the wish to extinguish it," says Mr. Bryce, "never crossed the mind of the barbarian."[2] Odoacer reigned as patrician, and Clovis was proud of the insignia of consul. But as new barbarian kingdoms were formed in the West, the authority of the Eastern Emperors became ever more ineffective and unreal, and in the eighth century it was only in name that Western Europe was subject to their sway.

The coronation of Charles the Great by Pope Leo III. in 800 restored to Western Europe an Emperor who was far more than the shadow of a

[1] Bryce, *ibid.*, "There was thus legally no extinction of the Western Empire at all, but only a reunion of East and West. . . . To those who lived at the time this year (476 A.D.) was no such epoch as it afterwards became, nor was any impression made on men's minds commensurate with the real significance of the event. For though it did not destroy the Empire in idea, nor wholly even in fact, its consequences were from the first great." So also Professor Bury emphasises the fact that Charles the Great was considered as the successor of the (Eastern) Emperor Constantine VI., and did not pose as the successor of Romulus Augustulus (*Later Roman Empire*, vol. ii. p. 507).

[2] Bryce, *ibid.*

great name. Already, before this great event, Charles had probably intended to acquire or assume the imperial dignity. His alleged reluctance may have been due, not to dislike of the title, but to the fact that he was constrained to receive it at the hands of the Pope.[1] The circumstances of the coronation left the relations of the Pope and Emperor ambiguous: on the one hand, it was certainly the Pope who bestowed the crown in the name of God; on the other hand, the Pope undoubtedly did obeisance to the new Emperor.[2] But Charles was not the man to allow his practical supremacy in religious matters to be disputed. His idea of a theocracy was not that the spiritual power should be superior to the secular, but that the Emperor should protect, favour, and control the

[1] For the circumstances of Charles's coronation, cp. Bryce, *op. cit.* ch. v., and Hodgkin, *Charles the Great*, ch. xi. Dr. Hodgkin is inclined to accept Professor Dahn's theory that what Charles disliked was not the bestowal of the title in itself, but its bestowal by the Pope; but he holds that, though the plan had been previously discussed among his courtiers, Charles's own mind may not have been fully made up as to the expediency of accepting the imperial diadem.

[2] "Leo the Pope, with the consent of all the bishops and priests, and of the senate of the Franks, and likewise of the Romans, set a crown of gold upon his head, the Roman people also shouting aloud. And when the people had made an end of chanting the *Laudes*, he was adored by the Pope after the manner of the emperors of old" (Chronicle of Moissac, quoted by Bryce, *op. cit.* ch. v.). Ere long it was argued that he who could elevate could degrade; he who could crown could discrown the Emperor (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book v. ch. i.).

Church ; and his Capitularies give detailed evidence of the thoroughness with which he carried out the principle.[1] His feeble successors could not exercise the same control, nor was it until Otto the Great refounded the Empire as a German power that the imperial influence again became in any degree effective. It was at this time that the Papacy had reached the lowest depths of moral degradation in men like Sergius III. and John XII., and some of the Saxon and Franconian emperors succeeded in asserting their right of confirming or even nominating the popes. With the election of Gregory VII. began the series of prolonged and bitter struggles between Pope and Emperor. The great Pope's short-lived triumph at Canossa was succeeded by his death in exile at Salerno, and the stubborn controversy on the question of Investitures raged for half a century until it was ended by the Concordat of Worms.[2] The strife of the two powers

[1] See Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vols. xcvii., xcviii., and cp. Bryce, *op. cit.* ch. v. "The laws which fix the obligations, the revenues, even the duties of the clergy, are issued in the name of the Emperor; they are monarchical and imperial, not papal or synodical canons" (Milman, *op. cit.* book v. ch. i.). On the one hand, Charles made large grants of land to the Church and gave the clergy a legal claim to tithe ; on the other he tried to subject all clergy to either canonical or monastic discipline ("ut vel veri monachi sint vel veri canonici"), and imposed many sumptuary regulations. Many of Charles's Capitularies are, of course, earlier than his coronation as Emperor.

[2] In Otto the Great (A.D. 962) "the German King became Roman Emperor" (Bryce, *op. cit.* ch. viii.). For the Saxon and Franconian Emperors, and for the struggles of Gregory VII. with

was renewed between Frederick Barbarossa and Hadrian IV.; in the thirteenth century Innocent III. and Innocent IV. carried the papal claims further than any of their predecessors, only to be outdone a little later by Boniface VIII. and his famous Bull *Unam Sanctam*.[1] By this time the strife of Guelf

the imperial power, see Bryce, chs. ix., x., and Milman, vols. iii. and iv. Otto III. nominated both Gregory V. and Sylvester II. (Gerbert), and thus did much to reform the Papacy. As regards Canossa, it has been pointed out by several critics that recent investigations have thrown a somewhat different light upon the significance of the events which took place there. The credibility of Lambert of Herzfeld has been impugned by more than one writer (*e.g.* O. Holder-Egger, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, xix. 537-563; cp. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, iii. 807 ff.); and it cannot be doubted that Lambert embellished the story of the Emperor's penance very freely. But we can hardly reject altogether the account given by Gregory himself, *Epist. ad Germanos* (*Registrum*, iv. 12), in which he describes Henry's arrival at Canossa—"ad oppidum Canusii, in quo morati sumus, cum paucis advenit, ibique per triduum ante portam, deposito omni regio cultu, miserabiliter utpote discalceatus et laneis indutus, persistens," etc. The truth appears to be that the Emperor sought to extricate himself from his difficulties by approaching the Pope as a private penitent, and that the Pope gave him absolution, although by doing so he interfered with the success of his own policy. Thus the *diplomatic* victory was on the side of the Emperor, but from another point of view it still seems right to describe the scene as a humiliation for the Emperor and a triumph for the Pope.

[1] In the Bull *Unam Sanctam* Boniface VIII. claims that both the Two Swords are in the power of the Church, the spiritual sword to be wielded by the Church, the temporal sword for the Church; but the temporal must be subject to the spiritual. He quotes the favourite text from Jeremiah (i. 10), and the Bull concludes with the all-embracing claim, "Porro subesse Romano

and Ghibelline had divided the cities of Italy into two hostile camps, and the partisans of Pope and Emperor developed their arguments in violent theological and literary controversies.

The full antithesis of the extreme papal and the extreme imperial theory can hardly be better illustrated than by reference to the controversy which raged during the struggle of John XXII. with Lewis of Bavaria in the early fourteenth century. On the papal side Augustinus Triumphus and Alvarus Pelagius expressed the claims of the *sacerdotium* in their most uncompromising form; on the imperial side Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham (who taught in Oxford) presented the case for the Empire with the most thorough-going anti-clericalism that is to be found before the Reformation.[1] In the eyes of Alvarus Pelagius the Pope has universal jurisdiction *in toto mundo, in spiritualibus et in temporalibus*, although his temporal jurisdiction should normally be exercised *per principes mundi*, and his dutiful son, the Emperor, ought to be the *advocatus et defensor ecclesiae*. Full use is made of the text *ecce duo gladii*, and both swords are claimed for the successors of Peter. *Pasce oves meas*, again, is interpreted as giving the rights both of earthly and of heavenly empire; and if the Church

Pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronuntiamus omnino esse de necessitate fidei." See Gieseler, *Church History*, ii. 35. An English translation is given in Henderson, *op. cit.* p. 435.

[1] For the papalist and imperialist claims in the fourteenth century, see Appendix, Note A, p. 387.

can judge angels, *a fortiori* the Pope has authority to judge Emperors and to depose them. The soul is more precious than the body; therefore, if spiritual supremacy belongs to the Pope, much more must temporal jurisdiction. Even the apparently unpromising text, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, . . . and all these things shall be added unto you," is twisted into the papal service, and becomes an argument for all temporal things being added to the Pope. The Pope transferred the Empire from the Greeks to the Germans in the person of Charlemagne, and the imperial electors derive their authority from the Pope, who is not *homo simpliciter*, but, in a sense, *Deus, id est vicarius Dei.* The Emperor is not the Vicar of God, for there can only be one Vicar; he cannot, therefore, summon councils or judge the clergy: indeed, every human being is subject to the Pope's judgment. No cleric can be subject to any lay jurisdiction, but even the Emperor is subject to any bishop or priest. Nobody can be justified in refusing obedience to the Pope, and he who has not the Pope for his Head cannot have Christ. There is one God, one Faith, one Vicar of Christ, one universal jurisdiction. Such is the papal claim at its highest; strangely enough, in view of later developments, the one claim that Alvarus refrains from making for the Pope is that of absolute infallibility or freedom from falling into heresy.[1] Other writers develop in greater detail the

[1] Alvarus Pelagius, *De Planctu Ecclesiae*, chs. xiii., xiv., xxxi., xxxvii., xl. (The passages referred to above are mainly from chs.

comparison of the Papacy to the sun and the Empire to the moon. A century earlier Innocent III. himself had drawn out the contrast of the greater and the lesser luminary, and by a precise astronomical computation some papal mathematicians estimated that the Pope was $7744\frac{1}{2}$ times greater than the Emperor.[1]

Thus it was that men like Alvarus Pelagius and Augustinus Triumphus elaborated on paper the claims which had been put forward in practice by Hildebrand, Innocent III., and Boniface VIII. Their antagonist Marsilius astounded his contemporaries by going equally far in the opposite direction. In his view sovereignty really rests with the people (*civium universitas*), which acts as lawgiver (*fidelis legislator*), and with the *princeps* or the

xiii. and xxxvii.) The translation of the Empire is thus described in ch. xiii.: "Imperator ab ecclesia Romana in persona Magnifici Caroli a Graecis imperium transtulit in Germanos, et Papa ipsum confirmat, inungit, coronat, approbat, reprobat, et deponit, et electores illam potestatem (*sc.* eligendi) ab ecclesia habent." With regard to the "Two Swords," Alvarus quotes and adopts the words of Bernard to Eugenius, "uterque ergo ecclesiae, et spiritualis scilicet et gladius materialis; sed is quidem pro ecclesia, ille vero ab ecclesia exercendus, ille sacerdotis, is militis manu, sed sane ad nutum sacerdotis et jussum imperatoris" (ch. xxxvii.). For papal fallibility, cp. ch. xv., "cum Papa ut homo peccare possit et decipi."

[1] Poole, *Mediaeval Thought*, p. 262. Dr. Poole observes that the analogy of the sun and moon is at least as old as Gregory the Seventh, and that the numerical ratio was very variously computed; according to a far lower estimate the ratio of proportional magnitude was only 47:1.

magistrates whom they appoint. The Church, on the other hand, is on a voluntary basis. Papal decrees have no temporal effect, and even the power of excommunication cannot be exercised without the consent of civil authority. The civil ruler alone can coerce heretics; he alone can dispense from human laws; it is for him to exercise a regulative power over Church officers and Church endowments, and to hear appeals in any cases which are first decided by ecclesiastical courts. Within the Church all bishops are of equal authority; doubtful points of divine law, fasts, questions of discipline, and so forth, are to be determined by a General Council.[1] The Papacy, indeed, is almost

[1] Marsilius, *Defensor Pacis* (printed in Goldast, *Monarchia*, vol. ii.), part iii., *Conclusiones*, where the results of the first two parts are summed up compendiously; see especially iv.-xi., xiv.-xviii., xxx.-xxxiii.

The influence of Aristotle is strongly marked in Marsilius. Part i. of the *Defensor* is largely occupied with an analysis of the *Ethics* and *Politics*. The whole work is in many respects extraordinarily modern in its principles and conceptions. In addition to his assertion that the sovereignty of the State rests with the people, Marsilius lays down the true principle of religious toleration, that religious error is not a matter for human tribunals or temporal penalties; cp. *Conclusio* iii. "ad observanda praecepta divinae legis poena vel supplicio temporali seu praesentis seculi nemo evangelica scriptura compelli praecipitur," and book ii. chs. ix.-x. Dr. R. L. Poole, in his excellent account of the *Defensor Pacis* (*Mediaeval Thought*, pp. 265-277), rightly calls this work "the greatest and most original political treatise of the Middle Ages," . . . containing "the whole essence of the political and religious theory which separates modern times from the Middle Ages"; cp. Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, p. 28.

ignored in the scheme of Marsilius, but it must be said of the *Defensor Pacis* that the writer is setting forth his own ideals of government rather than describing any existing conditions or reproducing any widely accepted imperialist view. The extravagances of the papalists drove him, by way of reaction, to propound this ideal polity, in which elements of Erastianism, secularism, and voluntaryism are intermingled with an almost revolutionary theory of popular sovereignty. Marsilius' work was significant in the history of thought, and it is noticeable that Henry VIII. caused it to be translated into English when he quarrelled with the Pope.[1] Not less important were the contemporary writings of William of Ockham, and the later theory of John Wycliffe.[2] But if we want to study a more typical example of current imperialist, as opposed to papalist, theory, we shall find it in the *De Monarchia* of Dante, which was written only a few years earlier. With Dante it is a primary principle

[1] The *Defensor Pacis* was translated by William Marshall, and published in London in 1535, under the title *The Defence of Peace*. The title-page displays the royal arms, and it is stated at the end that the object of the translation is to "helpe further and profyte the chrysten cõmenweale" . . . "in those busynesses and troubles whereby it is and before this tyme hath been injustly molested, vexed, and troubled by the spirituall and ecclesiasticall tyraunt."

[2] I have no first-hand knowledge of the writings of Ockham and Wycliffe which bear upon this controversy, and must refer to the accounts of them in Poole, *op. cit.* chs. ix., x.; Figgis, *op. cit.* lecture i.; and the numerous quotations and references in Gierke-Maitland, *Political Theories of the Middle Age.*

that there must be one universal State with one universal ruler, and that both the State and its ruler must be Christian. But with him the authority of the Emperor is derived immediately from God, and not mediately through the spiritual Vicar of God. He controverts in detail the papalist arguments drawn from the analogy of Sun and Moon, from the Two Swords, from the Donation of Constantine and the Coronation of Charles, and from Old Testament precedents. "Man had need," he concludes, "of two guides for his life, as he had a twofold end in life; whereof one is the Supreme Pontiff, to lead mankind to eternal life, . . . according to the things revealed to us; and the other is the Emperor, to guide mankind to happiness in this world in accordance with the teaching of philosophy." Caesar (Dante held) must be reverent to Peter, but "the authority of temporal monarchy comes down with no intermediate will from the fountain of universal authority."[1]

It requires a persistent effort for the modern

[1] Dante, *De Monarchia*, iii. chs. iii.-xvi. (ed. Moore, Oxford, 1895). The passages quoted are from ch. xvi. (xv.) "Propter quod opus fuit homini duplici directivo secundum duplicem finem: scilicet summo Pontifice, qui secundum revelata humanum genus perduceret ad vitam eternam; et Imperatore, qui secundum philosophica documenta genus humanum ad temporalem felicitatem dirigeret . . . Sic ergo patet quod auctoritas temporalis Monarchae, *sine ullo medio*, in ipsum de fonte universalis auctoritatis descendit." (I have made use of the translation of the *De Monarchia* by Mr. F. J. Church, in Dean Church's essay on Dante.)

mind to realise fully the principles which seemed obvious and fundamental to writers on both sides in the long controversy between Papacy and Empire. One side put the Emperor above the Pope, the other the Pope above the Emperor; in earlier days it had been thought that the two authorities were exactly balanced, as it were by some pre-established harmony, but experience soon proved that this harmony could never be realised in actual fact. Both sides alike, however, believed in "a uniform single State existing on a Christian basis," with orthodoxy and baptism as the conditions of citizenship. It is not correct, Dr. Figgis points out, to speak of the struggle as one between Church and State, as if they were conceived as being two separate societies. They were not pictured as two separate societies, but as one society; and the struggle was as to the relative dignity and position of its two functions, *sacerdotium* and *regnum*, and their respective officers.[1] The idea of Church and State as two completely independent societies was developed later, or rather was revived later, for it was a reversion to the earliest principles of Christianity, which had been completely obscured in the

[1] Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, p. 49: "The mediaeval struggles between popes and emperors are wrongly regarded as a conflict between Church and State, if by that is meant the relations between two societies. The mediaeval mind, whether clerical or anti-clerical, envisaged the struggle as one between different officers of the same society, never between two separate bodies; this is as true of Dante and Marsilius as it is of Boniface and Augustinus."

mediaeval mind. The principle of identity, which to the mediaeval mind seemed so self-evident, was derived, not from the New Testament or from the Ante-Nicene Church, but from the Jewish theocracy, from Constantine and Theodosius, from the Roman Law and the Code of Justinian, from the pagan imperial system and the worship of the Caesars, from the authority of the ancient State over national religion and over the worship of the national gods which was demanded from her citizens.[1]

Upon the moral and spiritual effects of papal aggrandisement, and upon the corruption which spread from the Papal Court throughout the mediaeval Church, it is not necessary to enlarge; indeed, the theme would be too vast. Were it necessary to appeal to witnesses, evidence might be found in abundance not only in the Protestant polemics of the age of the Reformation, but in the sad complainings of men who earnestly believed the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ, of ardent Churchmen who lamented to see the unlovely fruits of this aggressive theocracy, and confessed that in spite of its growth,

[1] It was the later Presbyterian theory which "developed the notion of Church and State as two distinct societies with different aims and officers" (*id.* p. 73). The principle that citizenship depended on baptism and orthodoxy was founded on the *Codex* of Justinian, which embodied and strengthened the exclusive religious legislation of Theodosius; see book i. tit. i., *De Summa Trinitate et de Fide Catholica.* The influence of Old Testament ideas and the transference to Christianity of the relations between the imperial authority and the national religion have already been traced in lectures iii. and iv.

perhaps because of its growth, the earth was still full of darkness and cruel habitations. If we may choose one single witness, let it be Dante. Every student of the *Divina Commedia* will remember the light in which that most profoundly religious of all great poems depicts the Papacy and the successors of St. Peter. We find, indeed, the early martyr-popes in Paradise; but Hadrian V. is atoning for his avarice in Purgatory, and Nicolas III. is expiating simony in Hell, along with Boniface VIII. (who strained the papal theory to its breaking-point, and is the special object of the poet's wrath and scorn) and Celestine V., whom Boniface (it was alleged) induced by fraud "to make through cowardice the great refusal."[1] To Dante the Donation of Constantine was no forgery, but a historical fact, and it was on this account that he apostrophises the first

[1] For some of these references I am indebted to a paper (privately printed) by Mr. W. W. Vernon on *Great Italians of the Divina Commedia*, where he examines the places assigned by Dante to popes and cardinals. Cp. *Paradiso*, xxvii. 40-45 (the martyr-popes); *Purgatorio*, xix. 88-126 (Hadrian V.); *Inferno*, xix. 31-78 (Nicolas III. and Boniface VIII.); xxvii. 91, 108 (Boniface VIII.); iii. 60 (Celestine V.); *Paradiso*, xxx. 148 (Boniface VIII.). The solemn invective against the Papacy and the corruption of the clergy which the poet puts into the mouth of St. Peter in *Paradiso* xxvii. would alone be sufficient evidence of Dante's bitter indignation; cp. ll. 22 f.

> Quegli che usurpa in terra il loco mio,
> Il loco mio, il loco mio che vaca
> Nella presenza del Figliuol di Dio,
> Fatto ha del cimitero mio cloaca
> Del sangue e della puzza, onde il perverso,
> Che cadde di quassù, laggiù si placa.

Christian Emperor as the fatal source of so great an evil, the secularised Papacy—

> Ahi, Constantin, di quanto mal fu matre,
> Non la tua conversion, ma quella dote
> Che da te prese il primo ricco Patre!

The bark of the Church was ill laden with a heavy freight for crossing stormy seas—

> O navicella mia, com' mal se' carca!

and whereas once—

> Soleva Roma, che il buon mondo feo,
> Due Soli aver, che l' una e l' altra strada
> Facean vedere, e del mondo e di Deo,
> L' un l' altro ha spento, ed è giunta la spada
> Col pastorale.
> . . . la Chiesa di Roma,
> *Per confondere in sè due reggimenti*,
> Cade nel fango, e sè brutta la soma.[1]

The tree must be known by its fruits; and the

[1] Ah, Constantine! to how much ill gave birth
Not thy conversion, but that plenteous dower
Which the first wealthy Father gained from thee!
Inferno, xix. 115-117.

"O poor bark of mine," it cried,
"How badly art thou freighted!"
Purgatorio, xxxii. 129.

Rome that turned it [the world] unto good,
Was wont to boast two suns, the world's and God's.
One since hath quenched the other; and the sword
Is grafted on the crook;
. . . The Church of Rome,
Mixing two governments that ill assort,
Hath missed her footing,—fallen in the mire,
And there herself and burden much defil'd.
Purgatorio, xvi. 106-110, 127-129.

(The passages are given in Cary's translation.)

quality of the fruits was unmistakable. Avarice, corruption, simony, pride and arrogance, cruelty and violence, luxury and grossest immorality—all these things had been fatally prevalent in the Papal Court for centuries before Dante. They had been deplored by the greatest churchmen of each generation, such as Arnold of Brescia, or Francis of Assisi; they had resisted the attempts at reform which were made by the best of the popes.[1] The depth of moral infamy to which the Papal Court could descend had been illustrated by the Tusculan popes and the pornocracy of Theodora and Marozia in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and was to be illustrated again by the House of Borgia in the fifteenth and sixteenth.[2] The position of universal

[1] For Arnold of Brescia, who was condemned by the Lateran Council of 1139, see Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, pp. 260 f. Arnold desired to reduce the clergy to a state of apostolic poverty, and to deprive the Church of all temporal power. This was a natural reaction against the temporal claims of Hildebrand. "Es gab andere, denen sich der Gegensatz zwischen einer mächtigen und herrschenden Kirche und dem Reiche, das nicht von dieser Welt ist, in schärferer Beleuchtung vor Augen stellte, und sie in eine Opposition drängte, die zum Bruche führen musste. Durch das ganze Mittelalter ziehen sich von jetzt an diese Erscheinungen hindurch. *Die erste bedeutende Persönlichkeit in diese Reihe aber ist Arnold von Brescia*" (Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyklop.* ii. 117, s.v. "Arnold von Brescia"). St. Francis did not come into direct conflict with the Papacy, as Arnold had done; but his idea of evangelical poverty was the same as Arnold's, and the implied conflict of principles was soon developed by his followers. Cp. Robertson, *op. cit.* p. 296.

[2] Benedict IX., one of the Tusculan popes, was advanced to the Papacy in 1033, at the age of ten or twelve, "cujus quidem

lordship over the whole world, spiritual and temporal, could not but produce the same fatal effect upon those of the popes who were naturally weak or vicious that it had produced upon the worst emperors; a Sergius III. or a Benedict IX. is only the counterpart of a moral monster such as Commodus or Heliogabalus.[1] The cardinals and the higher clergy shared in the corruption. The avarice and immorality which prevailed widely among the clergy generally is illustrated by the position which they occupy in the literature of the fourteenth century—in the writings, for instance, of Boccaccio in Italy, or of Chaucer and Gower in England.[2] The auto-

post adoptum sacerdotium vita quam turpis, quam foeda, quam execranda exstiterit, horresco referre." This description was given by Pope Victor III. (Milman, *op. cit.* book v. ch. xiv.). Theodora was the mistress of John X. who, according to one account, was imprisoned and killed by order of her daughter, Marozia. Afterwards, Marozia placed on the papal throne her son, John XI., who was said to be the son of Pope Sergius. John was accused of adultery, incest, sacrilege, and hideous cruelty, and deposed (Milman, *op. cit.* book v. ch. xii.). The wickedness of the Borgias is too well known to need illustration, but a candid account of Alexander VI., based on full research, will be found in Dr. L. von Pastor's *History of the Popes*, vol. v. pp. 362 f., 388 f., 522. ("Can we wonder that where the Borgia were concerned nothing was thought too horrible to be believed?")

[1] The parallel is obvious and real. I fancy that it has already been drawn by some historian, but I cannot trace any reference.

[2] Boccaccio, *Decamerone*, *passim*. Milman remarks that "nothing, however, sung or told in satiric verse or prose against the Court of Rome can equal the exquisite malice of the story of the Jew converted to Christianity by a visit to Rome, because no religion less than divine could have triumphed over the enormous

cracy of the popes was reflected in the privileges of the clergy, privileges which produced a fatal separation between them and the laity, and often exempted them from all effective control.[1] And, finally, it may be noted that the papal theory, which was intended to secure the centralised unity of Christendom, was, in fact, the preponderant cause

wickedness of its chief teachers, the cardinals and the Pope" (book xiv. ch. v.).

Chaucer's pictures of the Monk, the Friar, the Pardoner, and the Sompnour in the *Canterbury Tales* will be familiar to many readers. The contrast of the parish parson is significant of the higher esteem in which secular clergy were sometimes held. Gower's *Vox Clamantis* gives a detailed and even darker picture. See book iii., iv., *passim*, *e.g.* iii. 1061 :—

> Sic male viventes laicis exempla ministrant,
> Qui velut instructi more sequuntur eos:
> Sic ovis ex macula pastoris fit maculosa,
> Et cadit in foveam cecus uterque simul.

[1] The importance attached by ecclesiastics to the "benefit of clergy" is sufficiently illustrated by the struggle of Becket against Henry II. "The Church courts," writes Bishop Stubbs, "became centres of corruption which archbishops, legates, and councils tried to reform, and failed. . . . The spiritual jurisdiction over the clergy was an engine which the courts altogether failed to manage" (*Constitutional History*, ch. xix. *ad fin.*). One result of clerical wealth and clerical immunity was the extraordinary number of men in holy orders. Thus, in the diocese of Worcester 843 persons were ordained on April 9, 1337, and 613 on June 6, 1338. This meant an idle clergy, with the usual results of idleness. "Every town contained thus a large number of idle men, whose religious duties filled but a small portion of their time, who had no secular responsibilities, and whose standard of moral conduct was formed upon a very low moral ideal" (*id.*, *ibid.*). There is no reason to think that England was exceptional in this respect.

of the fatal disunion from which Christianity is even now suffering. We shall see that it was the abuses of which this system was the parent which led to the Reformation; and, in the same way, the great schism of the Eastern and Western Churches had its origin far less in any dispute about Iconoclasm or the *Filioque* clause than in the proud claim of Rome to exercise jurisdiction over Constantinople. This is evident to anyone who will read the story of the struggle between the Patriarch Photius and Pope Nicolas I. in the ninth century.[1] Christendom was finally rent asunder by the schism of East and West 200 years later. Once or twice efforts were made to restore the broken unity, especially when the Greeks needed Western help to resist the ever increasing pressure from Islam. At the Second Council of Lyons, and again at the Council of Florence, the Pope seemed to have succeeded in asserting his supremacy; but the general feeling of the Eastern Church repudiated the surrender which was agreed to by its leaders. Since the fifteenth century

[1] See Gibbon, ch. ix.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book v. ch. iv; Adeney, *Greek and Eastern Churches*, part ii. ch. vi. No doubt racial differences and the separation of the Eastern and Western Empires must also be taken into account as causes making for division. The latter influence became more operative in proportion as the Eastern Church became more and more identified with the Eastern Empire, and more "Erastian." It may be noted that the iconoclastic decrees of Leo the Isaurian were issued and carried out by imperial authority, and that the Patriarch Germanus resigned his office rather than assent to the innovations being introduced without the authority of an Ecumenical Council (Bury, *Later Roman Empire*, ii. 436).

the Eastern Church has dwelt apart, little affected by the controversies of the more mutable West, and no considerable attempt has been made on either side to bring about reunion.[1]

The sad and disastrous cleavage between East and West was destined to be followed in the sixteenth century by a still more memorable breach of unity within the Western Church itself. Of that great religious revolution we must not speak at any length to-day, yet we may notice here how frequent and how significant were the indications of revolt both against extravagances of principle and against abuses of practice for more than two centuries before the storm burst in its full fury. Sometimes the protest comes from a great bishop or religious leader, such

[1] The reconciliation of the Greek Church was one of the declared objects of the Second Council of Lyons (1274). Reunion was decreed, and the Greek clergy chanted the Nicene Creed without the omission of the *Filioque*, while the representative of the Eastern Emperor acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman See. But Michael Palaeologus failed to induce the Eastern Church to abandon its independence, and on his death the attempted reunion was entirely repudiated (Gibbon, ch. lxii.; Milman, *op. cit.* book xi. ch. iv.).

At the Council of Florence (1438-39) the course of events was very similar. The Eastern representatives accepted the *Filioque*, and acknowledged the primacy of the Pope, the Eastern Emperor obtaining in return distinct promises of help for the defence of Constantinople. But the popular resistance to the acceptance of the terms of union was even more marked than in the case of the Council of Lyons, and the attempt of John Palaeologus was absolutely fruitless. Within fifteen years Constantinople was taken by the Turks (Gibbon, chs. lxvi., lxvii.; Milman, *op. cit.* book xiii. ch. xiv.).

as Arnold of Brescia in the twelfth, or Robert Grosseteste of Lincoln in the thirteenth century.[1] Sometimes the depth of moral indignation stirred by spiritual wickedness in high places is evidenced by the fanaticism of Puritan sects, like the Waldenses and Albigenses, the Western Manichaeans, the Flagellants, and the Pastoureaux of Flanders; nor was any movement more dangerous to the papal claims than that of the "Spiritual Franciscans," who were true to the principle of poverty proclaimed by their founder, and to whom the enriched and secularised Papacy was the Great Harlot of the Apocalypse.[2]

[1] For Arnold of Brescia, see p. 200. Grosseteste combined a fervent hatred of abuses with a strong assertion of papal authority and the privileges of the Church: the greater the power the greater (so he held) was the responsibility. The Pope had *power* over all benefices; but yet, Grosseteste writes, "scio quoque quod quisquis abutitur hac potestate aedificat ad ignem Gehennae" (*Epist.* 49, ed. Luard, addressed to Cardinal Otho). It is not surprising that the attempts to get Grosseteste canonised did not succeed (F. S. Stevenson, *Robert Grosseteste*, p. 29).

[2] Some account of these and other sects or movements of the same type will be found in Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vols. iv.-vii.; Gieseler, *Church History*, ii. 549 f., iii. 171 f. We find in them religious fanaticism of a Puritan type mingling in varying degree with currents of democratic feeling, but the hatred of the secularised Church is a constant feature. The movement of the Fraticelli, or Spiritual Franciscans, was at once the most interesting and the most formidable. Celestine V. was their model Pope, and Boniface VIII. the object of their special hatred. It was they who first familiarised men with the idea that Rome was the Babylon and the Great Harlot of the Apocalypse, and they were among the early victims of the Inquisition (Milman, *op. cit.* book xi. ch. ix., book xii. ch. vi.).

And if the indignation of spiritual men was stirred by the spectacle of this awful corruption, the growing national spirit of countries such as England and France was roused by the arrogant usurpation of unbounded powers, the infringement of national rights, and the unblushing venality and rapacity which marked the action of the papal legates and agents. Even the pious St. Louis was stirred to protest against the more flagrant abuses, and it was his successor, Philip the Fair, who procured the removal of the Papal Court to Avignon, after he had brought Boniface VIII. to his end by the outrage of Anagni, and had arraigned him when dead before the tribunal of his successor upon charges of infidelity, blasphemy, and nameless vices.[1]

In England, for generations before the Reformation, a long series of measures was directed against papal intervention and against the extortions which had caused that country to be called "the Pope's

[1] The Pragmatic Sanction of 1260 is now acknowledged to be a forgery, but the hostility of St. Louis to the more extreme claims of Rome is beyond doubt. Cp. Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy*, p. 423. The extraordinary story of the impeachment of the dead Boniface, in the course of which many witnesses appeared to charge him with atheism, magic, and incredible profligacy, may be read in full in Dupuy, *Preuves de l'histoire du différend de Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel*, Paris, 1655. The *articuli probationum*, ninety-four in number, form a most revolting indictment. Although Boniface was not condemned, Clement V. acquitted Philip of all blame for bringing the charges, and annulled the Bulls and proceedings of his predecessor against France (Milman, *op. cit.* book xii. ch. iii.; Gieseler, *Church History*, iii. 13).

farm."[1] The lavish abuse of the awful powers of excommunication and interdict, and the unseemly spectacle of Frederick II. and Gregory IX.—the spiritual and the temporal lords of the world—exchanging definite challenges and denouncing one another in the sternest phrases of the Apocalypse, shocked the conscience of Europe. The papal captivity at Avignon, and the Great Schism, with its feud of Pope and Antipope, further impaired the reverence felt for the Papacy. It became necessary to take remedial measures, and men of good-will hoped much from the assembling of a General Council. The conciliar movement was a great feature of the fourteenth century, but the hope of any far-reaching reform from such methods was destined to disappointment. Although the immediate feud was ended, the long series of Councils—Pisa, Constance, Basel, Ferrara, Florence—failed both to secure the reunion of Christendom and to remove the abuses of the papal court and system. The inherent vices of the system were too great to be healed by any conciliar action, and in the sixteenth

[1] *e.g.* the repudiation of the Pope's claim to Scotland (1301), the prohibition of tallages (1307), the Statute of Provisors (1351), Praemunire (1353), and the repudiation of the tribute promised by King John (1366). Martin V. in vain demanded the repeal of anti-papal legislation in the reign of Henry V. And in addition to the anti-papal measures, there were such restrictions of clerical privilege as the statute *De Religiosis* (Mortmain, 1279), and *Circumspecte agatis* (1285). Cp. Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, vol. ii. chs. xiv., xvi.

As to the extent of the papal exactions, in addition to large

century there came the storm which shattered the Western Church to pieces.[1]

There was, undoubtedly, a certain impressive magnificence in the theory of a Christendom united under one visible personal Head, or in the relation of Pope and Emperor as the two great luminaries, the twin rulers of the world, the lieutenants of God upon earth. Undoubtedly, also, there were many popes of high aims and noble character, such as Gregory I. or Gregory VII. Nor need it be questioned that the Papacy may providentially have served great ends in preventing disunion at critical periods, and in enabling Christianity to accomplish the work of assimilating and civilising the barbarian nations.[2] Yet neither the splendour of a theory, nor the veneration for great names, nor the advantages

sums directly extorted by papal legates, Grosseteste calculated in 1252 that the foreigners nominated by the Pope to English benefices drew a revenue three times as large as that of the Royal Exchequer (Milman, *op. cit.* book x. ch. v.).

[1] The causes and significance of the conciliar movement and of its failure are ably set forth by Dr. Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, lecture ii. The conciliar party, he writes, "had the weakness of a purely academic movement except in so far as it expressed the general desire to close the schism" (p. 36), and its failure "forms the justification at once of the Reformation and of Ultramontanism" (p. 36). Cp. also notes 188-197 in Gierke-Maitland, *Political Theories*, pp. 154 f.

[2] The value of the work achieved in these directions under the papal system has been recognised by writers whose sympathies lie in quite an opposite direction. Cp. Guizot, *Histoire de la Civilisation en Europe*, sixième leçon; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book xiv. ch. i.; Fremantle, *Bampton Lectures* (2nd ed.), pp. 160 f.

of outward unity, must blind us to the facts. And the facts are (1) that the system of the mediaeval Papacy tended to secularise the Church more than it spiritualised the world, and (2) that the principle which underlay it is not one which can be reconciled with the New Testament and with the teaching and the method of Christ. Of the secularisation of the Church enough, perhaps, has been said incidentally during the course of this lecture, but the evidence is varied and inexhaustible. The centuries during which the papal system was most powerful are indeed sometimes termed the "Ages of Faith." It is only in the most external and negative sense of the word "faith" that the description can be justified. Is there not deep truth in Bishop Blougram's words?—

> "You'll say once all believed, man, woman, child,
> In that dear middle age these noodles praise.
>
> . . . . .
>
> How should you feel, I ask, in such an age?
> How act? As other people felt and did;
> With soul more blank than this decanter's knob;
> Believe—and yet lie, kill, rob, fornicate,
> Full in belief's face, like the beast you'd be."[1]

It was a faith, too, often resting on the principle

[1] R. Browning, *Bishop Blougram's Apology*. In chapter vi. of his *Service of Man* (1887), Mr. Cotter Morison collected many painful instances of the "coexistence of a very low moral tone with the most exalted religious zeal and passionate religious belief." The chapter is entitled "Morality in the Ages of Faith." Mr. G. G. Coulton's *From St. Francis to Dante* may also be mentioned as throwing light upon the seamy side of the life of these centuries.

of coercion and persecution with which the mediaeval Papacy was identified—a faith, at best, in a human system rather than in a Divine Person, an external faith which had little influence upon conduct.

And the system itself is irreconcilable with the New Testament. We must not err, like the Puritans, by imagining that Scripture contains a fully developed ecclesiastical polity, and that whatever is not there laid down in detail is "of sin."[1] But for ultimate principles we must always go back to Christ. In the first lecture we found certain first principles which Christ laid down for His Society. The papal system is not reconcilable with those principles. And then there are the sharp, decisive words of the text, "So shall it not be among you." It became the custom for the Pope of the Middle Ages to style himself with proud humility "*servus servorum Dei*"; yet in reality he claimed to be the "King of kings and Lord of lords," as when Boniface VIII., in the Bull *Ausculta Fili*, declared that he was "set over the nations and over the kingdoms to root out and to pull down and to destroy, and to throw down, to

[1] This was the Puritan contention. See Hooker, *Eccles. Polit.* books iii. and iv. Book iii. is concerned with the contention "that Scripture is the only rule of all things which in this life may be done by men"; and book iv. with the argument "that in Scripture there must be of necessity contained a form of Church polity, the laws whereof may in no wise be altered." In ii. ch. i. § 3, Hooker quotes what he calls "the head theorem" of his opponents, "that the Scripture of God is in such sort the rule of human actions, that simply whatsoever we do, and are not by it directed thereunto, the same is sin.'

build, and to plant."[1] So far as the mediaeval theory can claim any Biblical support, it is derived from Old Testament precedents, which were congenial to the mediaeval mind, and when New Testament texts are cited, they are tortured into its service by an impossible exegesis.[2] Christ's kingdom is not of this world. He who came to minister to men is not honoured by a scene like that of Canossa, or by an emperor holding the stirrup of a pope or kissing his foot. The roots of the mediaeval system did not lie in the New Testament, or in the Apostolic age, or in the Ante-Nicene Church. The system, so far as it appeals to the Bible, draws its support largely from the Old Testament; but its true lineage is from the alliance between the Church and the World, which was cemented in the fourth century; and

[1] Jeremiah i. 10. This text had been applied to the papal power by preceding popes (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, book xi. ch. ix. For the Bull, see Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum*, ii. 2006; Gieseler, *Church History*, vi. p. 349.

It was not till the ninth century that the title "servus servorum Dei" was applied exclusively to the Pope. Gregory the Great used it in some of his letters, and some isolated instances are found even before his time (Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, ii. p. 280).

[2] Enough has been said of the text "Ecce duo gladii," and of the explanation by Alvarus Pelagius of the text, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God." Dr. R. L. Poole notes the use made by John of Salisbury of the book of Deuteronomy for emphasising the supremacy of the Church over the World, and remarks that "hierarchical pamphleteers, almost without exception, draw their lessons from the theocratic, or rather sacerdotal teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures, or from the commonplaces of classical literature" (*Mediaeval Thought*, ch. viii.).

beyond that it goes back, as has been said, to a secular origin in the pagan imperial system of ancient Rome. It is not wholly without significance that the Pope assumed the title of *Pontifex Maximus*.[1]

"My kingdom is not of this world"; "So shall it not be among you." The papal system tried to set up a theocracy above the kingdoms of this world, to absorb the World and the State into the Church; and in doing so it was forced to use worldly weapons and immoral means. No historian can speak on this subject with a higher authority than Mr. Bryce. Let me quote his words. "By a law," he writes,

[1] Hobbes described the Papacy as the ghost of the old Roman Empire sitting enthroned on the grave thereof (Morley, *Diderot*, vol. i. ch. iv.).

Dr. T. M. Lindsay (*The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, pp. 351 f.) comments on the significance of the title *Pontifex Maximus*, which Tertullian had applied in scorn to a contemporary Bishop of Rome, and which the popes appropriated later. Probably Dr. Lindsay and the writers whom he follows have exaggerated the extent to which the Catholic hierarchy followed the organisation of the worship of the Emperors, since in both cases it would be natural and convenient to follow the lines of civil administration; but the title *Pontifex Maximus* is pagan in origin, and implies a claim to succeed to the control of State religion.

In his latest work, *Entstehung und Entwickelung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*, which has appeared since these lectures were delivered, Harnack writes cautiously about the direct imitation of the organisation of Caesar-worship: "Ich vermag von diesem Einfluss nichts zu erkennen ausser unwillkürlichen, freilich nicht unwichtigen, Analogie-Bildungen auf christliche Seite (der Kaiserkult war auf der Provinzialeinteilung des Reichs auferbaut)" (p. 115).

"to which it would be hard to find exceptions, in proportion as the State became more Christian, the Church, who to work out her purposes had assumed more worldly forms, became by the contact worldlier, meaner, spiritually weaker; and the system which Constantine founded amid such rejoicings, which culminated so triumphantly in the Empire Church of the Middle Ages, has in each succeeding generation been slowly losing ground, has seen its brightness dimmed and its completeness marred."[1]

The Church is a spiritual body independent of the World. She claims, indeed, a higher allegiance than any worldly power, but she debases instead of honouring herself when she uses secular weapons and descends into the arena of secular strife. It is not for her to claim thrones and to exercise lordships. Never must she aim at being greater than her Master, who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.

[1] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. vii.

LECTURE VI

THE REFORMATION AND ITS EFFECTS

A fight
That shows, even on its better side, the might
Of proud self-will, rapacity, and lust,
'Mid clouds enveloped of polemic dust,
Which showers of blood seem rather to incite
Than to allay.

WORDSWORTH, *Ecclesiastical Sketches*, Part II.

VI

THE REFORMATION AND ITS EFFECTS

2 Corinthians iii. 17 : "Now the Lord is the Spirit ; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

1 Corinthians xiv. 33 : "God is not a God of confusion, but of peace."

Our attention was directed in the last lecture to the Mediaeval Papacy and the Mediaeval Empire, and to their relations in theory and in practice. To-day it will be our task to consider the effects of the great movement which we call the Reformation, by which the whole system of the Papacy was profoundly modified, and the Pope was deprived of half of his spiritual dominion in Western Christendom ; while the Holy Roman Empire, although it lingered on in name for nearly three hundred years, became little more than a dignified archaeological phantom.[1]

[1] Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. v : "That it did not so expire [*i.e.* with the fall of the Hohenstaufen], but lived on six hundred years more, till it became a piece of antiquarianism hardly more venerable than ridiculous,—till, as Voltaire said, all that could be said about it was that it was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire,—was owing partly indeed to the belief, still unshaken, that it was a necessary part of the world's order, yet chiefly to it

The Reformation was a many-sided movement, the offspring of a number of combined causes; and to the men of our own generation it has many different meanings and values. One admirer sees in it primarily the triumph of the doctrine of Justification by Faith; another the victory of the open Bible; another the overthrow of intolerable moral and spiritual abuses; another the destruction of the system with which those abuses were connected, and of its great features, papalism, sacerdotalism, sacramentalism; to another it represents the rights of the individual conscience, the first stage in a slow process towards toleration and religious liberty. Our consideration must be strictly limited to what is relevant to our particular subject. With the Reformation as a movement of doctrinal change we are hardly concerned at all, nor is it for us to estimate its value in the direction of practical reform, as for instance in the removal or modification of such abuses as simony and the sale of indulgences. We must confine our view to its effects upon the relations between the Church and the World, and between the Church and the State or Civil Power. We have to inquire how it affected the policy and methods of the Church with regard to such matters as whole-

connection, which was by this time indissoluble, with the German kingdom." It should not be forgotten that, at the very time when the Empire finally disappeared, Napoleon delighted to proclaim himself the successor, not of Louis XIV., but of Charlemagne (*id. ibid.* ch. xx.); nor can the aspirations of the new German Empire be understood apart from the traditions of the mediaeval Empire, in spite of the obvious contrasts between the two institutions.

sale evangelisation, religious coercion, compromise with the World, State-alliance and State-control, spiritual independence; and how far it brought about any return to those principles which Christ laid down for His Church to follow, and from which, as we have seen, the Church of the Middle Ages had so widely and so disastrously diverged.

The Reformation did, it is true, produce in the end a wide-spread revolt against certain mediaeval doctrines; there is a great gulf fixed between Tridentine standards of faith and the Confessions of Augsburg and of Westminster. But in its origins the Reformation was a revolt against spiritual abuses of a practical sort rather than against doctrines. It was Luther's fierce indignation against the sale of pardons which led him to nail his ninety-five theses to the door of the church at Wittenberg;[1] and although to us "Calvinism" may primarily suggest predestination, and "Zwinglianism" a negation of the Real Presence, it was the practical abuses of papal or episcopal government, and the startling contrast between the ideals of the New Testament and the system under which they lived, which fired Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin, and gave them enthusiasm for their work.[2] We saw last week that protests

[1] Luther's Theses "are not a clearly reasoned statement of a theological doctrine; still less are they the programme of a scheme of reformation. They are simply ninety-five sledge-hammer blows directed against the most flagrant ecclesiastical abuse of the age" (*Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii. p. 129, in the chapter on "Luther" by Dr. T. M. Lindsay).

[2] "The Papacy must fall," said Zwingli as early as 1517

had been made against prevailing evils by a series of men imbued with a hatred of abuses and an earnest spirit of reform, from Arnold of Brescia to Wycliffe, Huss, and Savonarola.[1] These men were the precursors of the Reformation, and of their protests we may say "ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα,—these things were the beginning of travail." We noticed how the conciliar movement failed to grapple with the most deep-seated evils. The influences making for change were reinforced by the Renaissance and the

Switzerland abounded in ecclesiastical abuses, and the points on which Zwingli first came into conflict with the authorities were tithes, monasticism, and the question of sending a body-guard to the Pope from Zürich. The first doctrines which he attacked were those of purgatory and invocation, which led to practical abuses (cp. *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. ch. x. pp. 309-319).

The same feature appears in the early stages of Calvin's development. Dr. Fairbairn remarks that "the first edition of the *Institutio* is distinguished from all later editions by the emphasis that it lays, not on dogma, but on morals, on worship, and on policy. . . . What came to be known as Calvinism may be stated in an occasional sentence or implied in a paragraph, but it is not the substance or determinative idea of the book" (*Cambridge Modern History*, ii. p. 357).

[1] See lecture v. p. 205. Cp. Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 326. "The revolt we have been considering [*e.g.* in Arnold of Brescia, Dante, Marsilius, Ockham] is not against the mediaeval system of doctrine, but against the mediaeval system of Church law." Dr. Robertson adds that "the strictly theological opposition to the mediaeval system" began with Wycliffe, but that (apart from Wycliffe's rejection of transubstantiation) even Wycliffe and Huss were concerned "for the reform of the life rather than of the dogmas of the Church." The same, of course, is true of Savonarola.

new learning, represented by Erasmus; the mine was exploded by Martin Luther, who excelled in destructive rather than in constructive power.

Let us look first at the principles which guided the action of the three great continental reformers, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, and which found expression in the foundation of the Reformed and the Evangelical Churches. Between these three great reformers there were wide differences of view, and in none of them must we expect to find absolute consistency of principle or of action. Especially is this the case with regard to Luther. Martin Luther is popularly regarded as the mighty champion of individual liberty and of freedom of conscience, as the David who attacked and overthrew the Goliath of papal tyranny. It would be possible to quote many sayings of Luther which support this view, and it was natural that in the earlier stages of his revolt against an established system he should emphasise the claim of individual freedom, which, indeed, was in harmony with his doctrinal view of Justification by Faith.[1] So Luther began with

[1] Lord Acton, *History of Freedom*, p. 154, refers to several instances of Luther's claiming religious freedom, *e.g.* a passage in a letter to Spalatin (*Briefe*, ed. de Wette, i. 521): "Evangelium si esset tale quod [a] potentatibus mundi aut propagaretur aut servaretur, non illud piscatoribus Deus demandasset. Non est, mi Spalatine, principum et istius saeculi Pontificum tueri verbum Dei, nec ea gratia ullorum peto praesidium" (Nov. 4, 1520) The most decisive passages that I have seen are to be found in his treatise *Von weltlicher Überkeyt, wie weyt man yhr gehorsam schuldig sey* (1524). See the Latin translation (1525), pp. 20-22,

protests against the interference of the secular power and the idea of conversion by the sword or the hangman; but with changing circumstances his view underwent rapid alteration. Perhaps it is an over-statement to say with Lord Acton that Luther really hated liberty.[1] It is more charitable to suppose that circumstances, in the shape of the Peasants' War and Anabaptist excesses, drove him into the arms of the German princes. It is certain that he advocated the use of stern measures of repression against peasants and Anabaptists. It is the office of the State, he argues, to prevent abominations: the State cannot banish sin, but it can (and must) exterminate heresy. It can suppress the Mass; it can enforce excommunication. No prince, he tells the Duke of Saxony, can allow his subjects to be divided in religion; and if Catholics are allowed to exist at all, it must be as outcasts, like the Jews—not as a matter of right, but because it may be practically impossible to prevent it.[2] His

"Haeretici nulla externa vi cohiberi possunt. Alia ratione adoriaris oportet. Alia hic pugna, alia res item quam si ferro decernatur. Dei verbo hic bellum gerendum est."

[1] Lord Acton, *History of Freedom*, p. 156: "The notion of liberty, whether civil or religious, was hateful to his despotic nature, and contrary to his interpretation of Scripture." Dr. Figgis, on the other hand, holds that "Luther really believed in individual freedom, a fact which may be proved by a perusal of the *Liberty of a Christian Man*," but this belief was outweighed by circumstances and by literalistic interpretation of the Bible (*From Gerson to Grotius*, p. 75).

[2] Lord Acton, *op. cit.* pp. 158-164. He refers to several passages in Luther's letters, *e.g. Luthers Briefe*, iii. 50 (ed. De Wette);

arguments are supported by frequent appeals to Scripture, but we find that the appeals are generally to the Old Testament and not to the New—to precedents such as the extermination of false prophets and the destruction of the brazen serpent.[1] It would be completely erroneous, therefore, to credit Luther with any consistent vindication of religious toleration, or of the rights of the individual conscience, or of the independence of the Church from the control of the civil power. Luther's work, in effect, if not in intention, lay in the direction of Erastianism.[2] He never rose to the conception of Church and State as two mutually independent societies, never entirely liberated himself from the mediaeval idea that they were merely two aspects of the same

iii. 90; iv. 94. Dr. Geffcken, *Church and State*, i. pp. 305, 326, endeavours to maintain that Luther's view of the relations of Church and State and of liberty of conscience did not undergo a change; but it appears impossible to reconcile the opinions expressed in his treatise *On the Secular Power* (see p. 221) with those on which all his later action was based.

[1] Lord Acton, *op. cit.* pp. 158 and 163. Similar Old Testament precedents were appealed to by Melanchthon:—"Abusus missae per magistratus debet tolli. Non aliter atque sustulit aëneum serpentem Ezechias, aut excelsa demolitus est Josias" (*id. ibid.* p. 168); by Zwingli, *De vera et falsa religione*; and by Beza, *De haereticis*, p. 243. And in England Hooker's Puritan antagonists appealed to the examples of Saul, Asa, Jehosaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, as an argument for destroying churches in which idolatry had prevailed (Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. xvii.).

[2] Figgis, *op. cit.* p. 74; and p. 241, where he quotes Luther's words, "Weiss nun fast alle Welt, dass niemand so herrlich vom Kaiser und gehorsam geschrieben, als ich" (*Politische Schriften*, ed. Mundt, iv. 92).

society. He put the civil power before the spiritual, and helped (as has been well said) to transfer to the State most of the privileges which before the Reformation had belonged to the Church, and to invest the temporal sovereign with the halo of sanctity that had hitherto belonged to the ecclesiastical head.[1] But to Luther the temporal sovereign was no longer a single world-ruler; at the Reformation the civil unity of Christendom was broken up together with the ecclesiastical, and for the unity of the Empire was substituted a national or territorial system—a number of States, each with its "godly prince," who was invested with supreme coercive power in the religious as well as in the civil sphere.[2] Luther maintained the sanctity of the civil power, and urged the duty of non-resistance. He is rightly called the ancestor of the "high" theory of the

[1] *Id. ibid.* p. 81.

[2] The formation of distinct nationalities, with strong monarchies on a national basis, had been the most remarkable feature in the history of the centuries preceding the Reformation. The Papacy and the Empire had both attempted to supply the need of an international power, but in vain (Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. xv.). At the Reformation those Lutherans who were subjects both of the Empire and of a local prince who was a Lutheran naturally gave their loyalty to the latter (*id. ibid.* ch. xviii.). For the idea of the "godly prince" see Figgis, *op. cit.* pp. 62, 66. The idea appears in Luther's *Address to the German Nobility* (1520), "*Since then the temporal power is baptized as we are*, and has the same faith and gospel, we must allow it to be priest and bishop, and account its office an office which is proper and useful to the Christian community" (Wace and Buchheim, *Luther's Primary Works*, p. 165).

State, and his doctrine of the Invisible Church (although not consistently developed) tended to obscure ecclesiastical authority.[1] The practical outcome of his influence was the establishment of the principle "*cuius regio, eius religio*" at the peace of Augsburg. That celebrated maxim, as Professor Pollard aptly says, is "as fatal to true religion as it is to freedom of conscience. It is the creed of Erastian despotism, the formula in which the German territorial princes expressed the fact that they had mastered the Church as well as the State."[2] In each State the "godly prince"

[1] Luther's view as to non-resistance is clearly expressed in the passage quoted in Dr. Figgis' note, *op. cit.* p. 241, "Greift ein Kind wohl, dass christlich Recht sei nicht sich sträuben wider Unrecht; nicht zum Schwert greifen; nicht sich wehren," etc. For Luther as the ancestor of the high theory of the State, see Figgis, *op. cit.* p. 67.

The theory of an Invisible Church is traced in Appendix, Note A, p. 389.

[2] For Professor Pollard's criticism, see *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. p. 278, and cp. Figgis, *op. cit.* p. 69. This formula was the fundamental basis of the Peace of Augsburg (1555), although in the Confession of Augsburg, twenty-five years earlier, the separateness of the ecclesiastical and the civil powers had been distinctly recognised (part ii. art. vii. 11-18), and in his treatise *On the Secular Power* ("Von weltlicher Überkeyt"), 1524, Luther had declared that the temporal power encroached whenever it legislated for the soul. Thus Luther says explicitly (in part ii. Latin trans. 1525, p. 20), "anima non est sub Caesaris constituta potestate"; and, on p. 21, that, if a prince should require a subject to embrace certain beliefs, he should answer, "Lucifero non licet suum proxime Deum collocare thronum." The *beneficium emigrationis* was conceded at Augsburg as the sole mitigation of this local religious despotism in lieu of banishment (*ibid.* p. 339).

possessed the right of determining the religion of his subjects, and the only remedy for the aggrieved conscience was to find elsewhere a ruler of more congenial opinions. The Church in each State became a national organisation subjected to the general direction of the civil government. The State was thus invested with ample powers both over the individual and over the religious society, and the authority of the State was soon to be reinforced by the theory of the divine right of kings, which was not, as is popularly supposed, a development of high ecclesiastical ideas, but rather an assertion of the rights of the civil power against the spiritual.[1]

Between Luther and the other leaders of the Reformation there were certain points of difference as regards questions of Church government and the relations to the civil power, no less than on purely doctrinal matters. But for our present purpose these differences are not of great importance. Broadly speaking, the other leading Reformers on the Continent were subject to the same limitations as Luther. None of them really regarded Church and State as distinct and independent societies,

[1] Cp. Figgis, *op. cit.* pp. 71, 72: "The doctrine of the divine right of kings is in its origin, as a rapid reference to Dante will show, an assertion of the rights of the lay as against the ecclesiastical power. . . . The supporters of divine right were thinking first and foremost of the secular independence of foreign or internal ecclesiastical power, only secondarily of the rights of the king or the State against the individual." See also the same writer's monograph on *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings*, ch. iii.

or even approached to any theory of toleration and individual freedom of religious conviction. Melanchthon taught that the State must punish offences against the first table of the Decalogue no less than those against the second: the civil magistrates must not be merely the guardians of peace and plenty (*pacis et ventris custodes*), but must suppress heresy, and that not as being as a danger to the State, but simply as theological error. He approved of the burning of Servetus, and expressed his wonder that any Christian could object to such an act.[1] Bucer believed in the intervention of the State to support Church discipline.[2] Zwingli, at Zurich, acknowledged no distinction between Church and State. In his view the civil rulers possessed spiritual functions; they were bound to guarantee and supervise the exercise of the ministry of the Word by those to whom they delegated it, and to promote uniformity of belief among members of the community, on pain of forfeiting their office.[3]

[1] For Melanchthon's views on the religious functions of the State and on persecution, see Lord Acton, *History of Freedom*, pp. 164-168, and the references there given to Melanchthon's works, especially to ii. 711, iii. 246, viii. 520, 523 (in Bretschneider's *Corpus Reformatorum*). The second of these passages is characteristic. It occurs in a letter written in 1537: "propter hoc caeleste munus impertit eis (*sc.* magistratibus) societatem sui nominis, inquiens: *Ego dixi Dii estis*, id est, delecti divinitus ad conservandam veram religionem, ad prohibendam et abolendam idololatriam, ad conservationem justitiae, conjugiorum, pacis," etc. Deuteron. 17, *Deus Regem custodem facit legis, et doctrinae religionis.*"

[2] Lord Acton, *op. cit.* pp. 172-3.

[3] Lord Acton, *op. cit.* pp. 173-4; *Cambridge Modern History*,

The system established at Geneva by Calvin, the fourth centenary of whose birth is being celebrated this year, calls for special remark. Calvin's austere genius was speculative and logical: he thought out a well-planned system which was less conditioned by the circumstances of any particular country or city than that of Luther or Zwingli, and then by force of personal influence and will he imposed his ideal on the city-state of his adoption. Calvin held that the support of religion was the chief office of the State: only he did not, like Zwingli, subject the Church to the State, but the State to the Church. His system approximates to a pure or direct theocracy, whereas the Zwinglian system may be described as an "inverted" theocracy.[1]

ii. pp. 317 f.; Geffcken, *Church and State*, i. pp. 335-6. Zwingli's views are expressed in his *De vera et falsa religione*, where there is a section near the end "De magistratu" (*Opera*, ed. Schuler and Schulthess, iii. pp. 296 f.). Cp. p. 297 "pronunciamus aequum scilicet ac justum magistratum ne esse quidem posse, ni Christianus sit"; and p. 303 "invenimus autem non, ut isti dicunt, sacerdotalem et laicalem esse magistratum, sed unum tantum."

[1] We learn more from Calvin's life and actions than from his writings with regard to his views on the relations of Church and State, and on the use of coercion to preserve unity of doctrine and of morals; but cp. *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, iv. ch. xx. "De politica administratione," especially § 3. It is the business of civil government to provide "ne idololatria, ne in Dei nomen sacrilegia, ne adversus eius veritatem blasphemiae aliaeque religionis offensiones publice emergant ac in populum spargantur" . . . "nec quemquam moveat quod recte constituendae religionis curam ad hominum politiam nunc refero quam extra hominum arbitrium potuisse supra videor; siquidem nihilo hic magis quam

The government of Geneva was charged with the suppression of heresy as well as with the purification of morals. The reprobates, who were many, were to be coerced by a civil power representing the elect, who were few: any prince (or government) who denied the true faith was deemed to have abdicated or forfeited authority *ipso facto*, but in the case of an orthodox prince non-resistance was a matter of duty. The death-penalty was reserved for heresy, which was viewed as apostasy; and by the burning of Servetus, Calvin showed the intensity of his conviction as to the necessity of forcibly suppressing theological error. Servetus was not a dangerous heresiarch; he was not even a citizen or a regular inhabitant of Geneva. But in the eyes of

antea leges de religione ac Dei cultu hominibus suo arbitrio ferre permitto quum politicam ordinationem probo." Other references also are given by Lord Acton, *op. cit.* pp. 176 f. Cp. Dr. Fairbairn in *Cambridge Modern History*, ch. xi. Lord Acton calls Calvin's theory a "pure theocracy"; Dr. Fairbairn describes it as "a theocracy, not a hierocracy: the clergy did not reign, nor did the organised Church govern; but God reigned over Church and State alike, and so governed that both magistrates and clergy were his ministers." But in practice, under the *Ordonnances ecclésiastiques* (1542), the State, taking its commission from the Church, enforced religion and morality by secular means, in spite of Calvin's assertion that spiritual and civil government were distinct things, and that the State had no rights over conscience. Cp. *Institutio*, iv. ch. xx. § 1 "neque difficile intelliget, spirituale Christi regnum et civilem ordinationem res esse plurimum sepositas." But in § 9 of the same chapter Calvin extends the office of the magistrate "ad utramque legis tabulam," on the strength of Jewish precedents.

Calvin and of Beza, who shared Calvin's views and vigorously defended his action, Servetus was an obstinate heretic, and, as such, far worse than any parricide, and deserved death, even if he repented.[1] While purity of belief was thus safeguarded by stern sanctions, purity of morals was the object of an equal solicitude. The Consistory, which was charged with the task of censorship, and possessed the power of excommunication, was a body which represented both Church and State, and typified the union of the two in the Genevan model. It consisted of six ministers and twelve elders, the latter representing the three councils of the city. The jurisdiction was spiritual, but the methods and powers of punishment were civil. The members of the Consistory kept a vigilant look-out for all cases of irregularity. Once a week this body met, passed sentences from which there was no appeal, and handed over the offenders to be dealt with by the civil power, whether the offence were adultery, or absence from a sermon, or the singing of profane

[1] "The circumstances of the condemnation of Servetus make it the most perfect and characteristic example of the intolerance of the reformers" (Lord Acton, *op. cit.* p. 184). Beza defended the act in his work *De haereticis*, and it "was almost unanimously applauded by all sections of Protestants" (Lecky, *Rationalism*, vol. ii. ch. iv. part ii.). Melanchthon called it "pium et memorabile ad omnem posteritatem exemplum" (*Opp.* ix. 133, ed. Bretschneider). Beza's treatise, *De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis* (1554), written in answer to Bellius (Castellio), appears to be the most systematic defence of persecution in this period.

songs to psalm-tunes.[1] Calvin had an almost unbounded belief in the virtue of positive law, and the spiritual tyranny which he established in the Church-State of Geneva represents the desperate endeavour of a great and earnest mind to set up an earthly *Civitas Dei* on the basis of enforced uniformity in faith and morals. If the endeavour failed, it is because all religious systems which refuse to respect human freedom are in the end found to be a fighting against Nature, and therefore a fighting against God.

Let us now turn from the tenets and methods of the chief Continental reformers to consider some main characteristics of the Reformation in England, which must needs be a subject of peculiar interest to ourselves. The English Reformation was in some respects insular: it does not conform exactly either to the Lutheran, or to the Zwinglian, or to the Calvinistic type, although there was constant intercommunication between Protestant leaders in England and those abroad, and the course of the movement was influenced, more or less, by the teaching of all the great foreign divines.[2] In

[1] Geffcken (*Church and State*, i. 340) gives some details of the working of the system. "Anabaptists were flogged; persons suspected of heresy were tortured if they refused to confess; three men, who had laughed during a sermon, were sentenced to imprisonment." . . . "Adultery was punished with death; a woman was to be burned for singing immodest songs. Between 1542 and 1546 no less than 58 persons were sentenced to death and 76 to banishment."

[2] Thus the foreign refugees, especially Bucer, Peter Martyr,

England, to a notable extent, the Reformation was not at first a doctrinal movement, but a national revolt against papal authority, precipitated by a sufficiently unworthy cause, the matrimonial irregularities of the reigning monarch, and finding its basis of support in the popular indignation against the gross abuses and extortions of the papal *régime*. The movement in England has two clearly marked features. It was intensely national, and it was strongly influenced by the arbitrary despotism of the Tudor sovereigns.[1] We have noticed how the

and John à Lasco, exercised a strong influence on the change of the Prayer Book in 1552, and Bullinger, by his correspondence with the English Puritans, represented the views of Zurich. The Puritans of Elizabeth's reign were dominated by Calvin. Cp. Aubrey Moore, *History of the Reformation*, pp. 204 f.; and for Calvin's influence see Hooker's wonderful picture of him in the Preface to *Ecclesiastical Polity*, ch. ii., *e.g.* § 8, "His books almost the very canon to judge both doctrine and discipline by."

[1] "A recasting of Catholic doctrine was not contemplated by Henry VIII., nor was any part of the Roman teaching rejected except that which was inseparably connected with the Pope's claim of universal jurisdiction, or with the abuses, financial or otherwise, on which so much of his power rested" (Aubrey Moore, *op. cit.* p. 6). In the first Act for the Restraint of Annates, etc. (23 Henry VIII. ch. xx., 1531-32) it is laid down that the king and his subjects "be as obedient, devout, Catholic, and humble children of God and Holy Church as any people be within any realm christened." The national character of the Reformation under Henry VIII., and the despotic methods by which he carried it through, are best seen by a glance at the ecclesiastical legislation of the Reformation Parliament (1529-1536). A convenient conspectus of this is given by Aubrey Moore, *op. cit.* pp. 90-92; cp. also *Report of Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, vol. i., Appendix by Bishop Stubbs, of which a

Lutheran Reformation in Germany meant the disintegration of the imperial no less than of the papal unity of Western Christendom. Henry VIII. had himself been a candidate for the imperial crown; but under his successful competitor, Charles V., and Charles' immediate successor, the former position of the Holy Roman Emperor as the rightful temporal Head of Christendom was for ever lost. It was fatally undermined by the breach of religious unity.[1] Henry himself was intensely jealous for the absolute independence of the realm of England. The preamble of his statute for the Restraint of Appeals (1533) lays stress on England being an empire, and the English crown an imperial crown, possessing plenary power and jurisdiction "without restraint or provocation to any foreign princes or potentates in the world."[2] The right of appeal to Rome was

careful abstract is given in Mr. Spencer L. Holland's *Summary of Ecclesiastical Courts Commission's Report*, 1884.

[1] See Mr. Bryce's chapter (xviii.) on "The Reformation and its Effects upon the Empire," in his *Holy Roman Empire*.

[2] 24 Henry VIII. (1532-33), c. 12. The preamble begins as follows—"Whereas by divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the world: governed by one supreme head and king, having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown of the same, unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people divided in terms and by names of spiritualty and temporalty been bounden and owen to bear next to God a natural and humble obedience," etc. The preamble then proceeds to assert that the king derives from God plenary authority and jurisdiction to render justice and final determination to all subjects in all causes "without restraint

utterly abolished, and the papal jurisdiction ignored; so far as England is concerned, the sphere of alliance (or arena of contention) between Church and State was henceforth to be purely national. In the condition of royal authority existing in Tudor times this meant a large measure of control by the Crown. The arbitrary measures of Henry, the development of Protestantism under Edward VI., the return to the Roman obedience under Mary, and, finally, the Elizabethan settlement, were in fact modified applications of the principle accepted at Augsburg, *cuius regio, eius religio.* The "godly prince" claims the power of determining the precise form of the religion of his subjects; and, acting sometimes through and sometimes apart from the spiritual authority, he also exercises a large measure of supervision and control over ecclesiastical affairs. Into the endless controversies as to the real nature and exact limitations of the royal supremacy over the Church of England it is impossible for us to enter here—nor am I equipped with the legal knowledge for doing so—but there are a few points which it is worth while to remember with regard to it. In the first place, the supremacy has a largely negative aspect; the repudiation of papal or any foreign jurisdiction occupies a prominent place in the documents which are concerned with it.[1]

or provocation to any foreign princes or potentates of the world." The statute is thus not only antipapal, but claims for the King of England a power co-ordinate with that of the emperor.

[1] Cp. the passage from the preamble of the statute for the

Secondly, the extreme claim (that of supreme headship), which Henry VIII. made, was modified under Elizabeth, and many instances of arbitrary intervention by Henry and by the Council of Edward VI. in the administration of Church affairs do not constitute any real precedent for later times.[1] Thirdly, the royal claim to "chief Government" in ecclesiastical affairs was not regarded as being an entire innovation. The Norman and Plantagenet kings had claimed a supervisory or visitatorial power. The idea that such a power resided in a Christian king was defended in the Canons of 1604 by reference to Jewish kings and to Christian emperors in the Primitive Church. The Old Testament argument was strongly urged, and Bishop Jewel

Restraint of Appeals quoted in the preceding note. The same characteristic is found in the Act for the Restraint of Annates, and the Act against Papal Dispensations, Peter's pence, etc. (25 Henry VIII. c. 21). In the previous year the king had ordered that none should preach at Paul's Cross without declaring that the Pope's authority was no greater than that of any foreign bishop; and henceforth the Pope is alluded to in State papers as "the Bishop of Rome" (Gairdner, *English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 144).

[1] Cp. Wakeman, *History of the Church of England*, p. 323: "Practically as an active force in English affairs, they [*i.e.* the claims to administer the affairs of the Church, to be the chief ordinary of the Church, and to be the source of jurisdiction in the Church] lasted only from 1534 to 1554, and thus synchronise with the period in English history when the constitution was in abeyance and the authority of the Crown absolute. No one would think of deriving any precedent in constitutional history from the reigns of Henry VIII. or Edward VI., either as regards the affairs of the Church or of the State."

wrote that "Queen Elizabeth doth as did Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Josias, Jehosaphat."[1] Again, the supremacy was largely a personal relation. The prince was a single individual, *ex hypothesi* "godly," sharing in, and making himself the champion of, the faith and life of the Church. It is plain that such a relation must be profoundly modified in practice when personal government gives way to a democratically elected Parliament, and when Parliament not only represents, but is composed of, men of every variety of religious opinion. The whips of a "godly prince" are less formidable than the scorpions of a potentially godless parliament. Finally, it cannot be denied that the royal supremacy has been so vaguely defined as to leave a large area of possible conflict, alike in the legislative, the executive, and the judicial spheres. The vexed question as to the proper relations between Convocation and Parliament, and the disputes as to the constitution of the Final Court of Appeal at the present day, are part of our *damnosa hereditas* from the Tudor sovereigns. The legal enactments regarding the supremacy may be (as I believe they are) patient of a less Erastian interpretation than lawyers have often put upon

[1] Jewel, *A View of a Seditious Bull* (*Works*, iv. 1145, edn. of the Parker Society). So the Thirty-seventh Article speaks of "that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all *godly Princes* in holy Scriptures by God himself." Cp. canon 2 of the Canons of 1604; and see Wakeman's note on the royal supremacy (*op. cit.* pp. 315 f.), and Bishop Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles* (5th ed.), p. 770.

them ; but, at the best, and apart from the principle involved as to spiritual jurisdiction, they have been a fruitful cause of strife, and a frequent impediment to the natural growth and development of the Church and to the power of adapting herself to changing circumstances. But of this more will be said hereafter.[1]

In Scotland, as in England, the Reformation proceeded on strictly national lines. Papal jurisdiction was abolished, and the nation became the religious unit. But here the resemblance ends. Whereas in England the power of the Crown was at this time almost absolute, in Scotland the Crown was weak, and the crisis of the Reformation coincided with the reign of the unhappy Mary. Hence the course of the Scottish Reformation was mainly guided, not by an arbitrary monarch such as Henry or Elizabeth, but by the ardent reformer and disciple of Calvin, John Knox. Knox, in his struggle with Mary, maintained the independence of the Church and the liberty of her assemblies. After Mary's abdication a statute was passed (1567) which recognised "the ministers of the Evangel and the

[1] For a careful and temperate interpretation of the royal supremacy from an "ecclesiastical" point of view I cannot do better than refer to Mr. Wakeman's account, mentioned in the two preceding notes. A more Erastian interpretation will be found in Dr. Fremantle's *Bampton Lectures*, lecture vi. It should be remembered that the statutes of Elizabeth's reign are the only ones now in force with regard to the supremacy; as to their ambiguity cp. Makower, *Constitutional History of the Church of England*, pp. 256 f.

people who with them profess Christ" to be "the only true and holy Kirk of Jesus Christ within this realm." The sovereign was bound by his coronation oath to maintain the true religion, and root out of the kingdom "all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God that shall be convicted by the true Kirk of God of the foresaid crimes."[1] In 1572 an oath of royal supremacy was imposed, which departed perceptibly from the English model—the king was to be recognised as "supreme governor of this realm as well in things temporal as in *the conservation and purgation of religion.*"[2] Scotland accepted the Presbyterian system, which, James I. declared, "agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil."[3] The Presbyterian system was welcomed by the great mass of the Scottish people, and the Established Church of Scotland has enjoyed down to the present day, and still enjoys, a position of far greater liberty and autonomy than has been

[1] For some main features of the Reformation in Scotland, cp. Professor Maitland's chapter (xvi.) on "The Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation" in *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii.; A. Taylor Innes, *Law of Creeds in Scotland*, chs. i., ii. For the statute of 1567 and the coronation oath, cp. Taylor Innes, *Church and State*, p. 153; Geffcken, *Church and State*, i. p. 400.

[2] Elizabeth, on the other hand, was declared to be "Supreme Governor of this realm as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal" (Maitland, *op. cit.* p. 596).

[3] Taylor Innes, *op. cit.* p. 179. James's remark was provoked by the suggestion of a "presbytery" at the Hampton Court Conference. He lectured the Puritan representatives on the text "No bishop, no king" (Frere, *English Church in Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.*, p. 297).

accorded to the Church of England either by the Crown, or by Parliament, or by the Courts of Law. There is probably no other Church recognised by any State as the National Church, which has nevertheless retained so much independence of action—a result which is perhaps due, in part, to the fact that the admission of the lay element to the Presbyteries has secured to the laity a large share of control.[1]

Time fails us for following the fortunes of the Reformation in other countries, nor indeed would it add much that is material to the argument if we did. The new relations of Church and State varied in different lands, but everywhere the Reformation brought in the national principle, *i.e.* the nation became the religious unit. Even in Roman Catholic countries the claims of the State and of the nation

[1] An interesting account of "The Principles and Conditions of the Scottish Establishment" will be found in an essay by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, No. iii. in *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*, edited by Bishop Gore. In his concluding words Lord Balfour emphasises two points: (1) "that the State recognises a jurisdiction as inherent in the Church, and while adding to it and providing means whereby it can be carried into effect, does not profess to confer it *ab initio*"; (2) "that within her sphere the Church of Scotland possesses legislative power to regulate her own affairs . . . without reference to any external authority whatsoever." To take a concrete instance of present interest, the civil courts in Scotland would not, I believe, intervene to regulate the terms of admission to communion, supposing that communion were to be refused owing to marriage with a deceased wife's sister. Some legal opinions on the legislative and judicial powers of the Church of Scotland are given by Mr. A. Taylor Innes, *Law of Creeds in Scotland*, Appendix to ch. iv.

were more strongly pressed.[1] And within the national unit men still clung to religious uniformity and coercion. The Reformation did not at once sweep away the mediaeval ideal of enforced uniformity. Toleration was a plant of slow growth. So completely had the true doctrine of the New Testament been obscured, that it was a long process to recover the principle of tolerance in theory, and a still longer one to apply it in practice. The sixteenth century was emphatically the age of persecution. The total number of victims must have largely exceeded the total number of Christian martyrs in the third and fourth centuries. In extent and severity the persecutions set on foot by Rome excelled those of the Protestant powers. The historian of the Spanish Inquisition (which was a national and not a papal institution) estimates that over 30,000 persons were burnt by that tribunal alone, and that nearly 300,000 were condemned to minor punishments. The whole population of the Nether-

[1] Cp. Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, p. 68: "The prince, officially 'most religious,' within a nation unitary in religion, in finance, in bureaucratic management, striving to secure morality, and to repress vice as well as crime, is the ideal alike of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation." Thus even in Roman Catholic countries we find a growth of religious nationalism, *e.g.* of Gallicanism in France in the reign of Louis XIV. The celebrated *Declaratio Cleri Gallicani*, issued in 1682 and recanted ten years later, marks the zenith of Gallicanism. The four articles which it contains were revised by Bossuet, and Louis XIV., who is said to have contemplated at this time the creation of a Patriarchate of Paris, prohibited the teaching of any contrary doctrines (Geffcken, *Church and State*, i. pp. 426-430).

lands was condemned to death by a single sentence of the Holy Office, and the number of those who actually perished there under Charles V. has been variously computed at from 50,000 to 100,000.[1] Protestant persecutions were less sanguinary, and were less rigorously carried out, but the principle of coercion was recognised universally in the national settlements of religion.[2] "Persecution," says Hallam, "is the deadly original sin of the Reformed Churches."[3] The earlier utterances of Luther were forgotten, and a long *catena* of names might be cited to show that almost every Protestant leader of the sixteenth century justified coercion. Zwingli, Socinus, and Castellio are almost the only names of note on the other side.[4] The last-named

[1] The numbers of the victims of the Inquisition are cited by Lecky (*Rationalism*, ii. ch. iv. part ii.) from Llorente, *Hist. de l'Inquisition*, iv. 271-272. For the facts about the Netherlands, see Lecky, *ibid.*, and Motley, *Dutch Republic*, ii. 155. Dr. Fairbairn records that in 1581 a book, dedicated to Henry III., places the number of those who had fallen for "the religion" in France at 200,000 (*Cambridge Modern History*, ii. p. 347).

[2] For Lord Acton's view of the distinction between the Protestant and the Catholic theories of persecution, see Appendix, Note B, p. 391.

[3] Hallam, *Constitutional History* (7th edition), vol. i. ch. ii. p. 95. Cp. *id. Literature of Europe*, ii. pp. 111-116.

[4] It is doubtful whether Zwingli ought to be counted on the side of toleration. He was far more tolerant than Calvin, but he approved of the forcible suppression of the Anabaptists at Zurich (*Cambridge Modern History*, ii. ch. x.). Lord Acton reckons him as a defender of persecution, but not a fanatical persecutor (*Hist. of Freedom*, p. 174).

For Socinus, cp. Lecky, *Rationalism*, ii. ch. iv. part ii

opposed the burning of Servetus, and was one of the first writers to assert the duty of absolute toleration. In consequence of his bold plea he died in disgrace and almost in starvation.[1] Towards the close of the seventeenth century Bossuet maintained that the only Christian bodies which repudiated the right of the civil magistrate to punish religious error were the Socinians and the Anabaptists; while an eminent French Protestant, Jurieu, who was an antagonist of Bossuet, boldly asserted that but for the coercion applied by Constantine and his successors three-quarters of Europe would still be pagan, and that it would be impious to condemn the ways which Providence had uniformly chosen for the establishment of true religion, except in the very beginnings of the Church, when the power of working miracles had rendered the use of coercion unnecessary.[2] We need not pursue the controversy

"The second [Socinus] was so distinctively the apostle of toleration, that this was long regarded as one of the peculiar doctrines of his sect."

[1] Castellio is an interesting and pathetic figure, to whom history has hardly done sufficient justice, though he was appreciated by Montaigne, and a full account of him was given by Bayle (*Dictionnaire*, s.v. "Castalion"). Cp. Hallam, *Hist. of Literature*, ii. p. 113; Lecky, *Rationalism*, ii. ch. iv. part ii. His real name was Chatillon, and he wrote as Martin Bellius. Calvin and Beza heaped every kind of abuse upon him; Beza's *De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis* was a direct reply to his treatise.

[2] This most remarkable passage from Jurieu's *Droit des deux souverains en matière de religion, la Conscience et l' Expérience*, an answer to Bayle's *Contrains-les d'entrer*, is given in full in Lecky, *Rationalism, loc. cit.* Bossuet's statement is quoted by the same

between those who assert that Protestantism persecuted for reasons of political expediency and those who lay stress on its determination to extirpate theological error as a sin and a blasphemy against God. The weight of evidence appears to show that both motives were operative, and that the latter was at once the stronger and the more wide-spread.[1] But we may remark that, although the Reformation did not immediately promote toleration, it contained within itself principles which ultimately favoured it. By striking a blow at the authority of the Church, and by favouring private judgment and individual interpretation of the Bible, the Reformation encouraged diversity of religious opinions. The sects became fissiparous, Dissent grew strong, Rationalism began to show itself. The practical difficulties of enforcing conformity increased, and this cause, combined with a general softening of manners, tended to discredit coercion and to favour tolerance. In loftier minds, also, there was springing up a truer appreciation of the spirit and meaning of the New Testament, and there was also a rapidly growing latitudinarianism and indifference, which exercised an influence in the same direction.[2]

writer from *Variations des Églises protestantes*, ch. 56: "Il n'y a point d'illusion plus dangereuse que de donner la souffrance pour un caractère de vraie Église, et je ne connois parmi les Chrétiens que les Sociniens et les Anabaptistes qui s'opposent à cette doctrine."

[1] See Appendix, Note B, p. 391.

[2] The connection between latitudinarianism and toleration is traceable in Castellio, Socinus, and an obscure writer, Aconcio,

Bishop Creighton held that toleration came empirically, because it was found that it could be granted without practical harm.[1] At all events it developed slowly, both with theorists and among legislators. Milton pleaded eloquently for tolerance, but could not bring himself to extend it to Roman Catholics—not only (be it remarked) because they were disloyal, but because they were idolaters.[2] Cromwell protected Jews, and tolerated various forms of Protestantism, but he excepted "Prelacy"

whose work Hallam compares with that of Castellio. Aconcio regarded the doctrines both of the Real Presence and of the Trinity as non-essential, in his work *De stratagematibus Satanae*, published at Basel in 1565 (Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, ii. 114). The effects of the spread of Rationalism, of the mingling of religions caused by the Reformation, of the marriage of the clergy, and of commercial intercourse, are traced by Mr. Lecky, *Rationalism*, ii. ch. iv. part ii., and ch. vi.

[1] Creighton, *Persecution and Tolerance*, p. 114: "It was not the product of superior enlightenment, still less of growing indifference to religious questions. It was the result of social development, and it rests solely on the basis of empiricism. Practically, we are tolerant because no harm comes of our being so." This view appears to me to be an inadequate explanation, and only half true.

[2] For Milton's tolerance, see *Areopagitica*; and for his views on "Popery," the tract *Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration*. As regards Roman Catholics, he says in this tract that "toleration is either public or private, and the exercise of their religion, so far as it is idolatrous, can be tolerated neither way"; and he proceeds to refer to Ezekiel viii. 7, 8, 12. Milton's attitude, based on an Old Testament theology, appears to make strongly against Bishop Creighton's theory that intolerance was political rather than religious.

and "Popery" from his list of tolerated creeds.[1] Jeremy Taylor wrote *The Liberty of Prophesying* as a plea for toleration, in which he included Roman Catholics; but in his later writings he seems to acknowledge some right of coercion by the sovereign.[2] Locke, in his *First Letter on Toleration*,

[1] It is in some degree true of Cromwell that his refusal to tolerate Roman Catholics was political rather than religious. He held that "the magistrate hath the supremacy; he may settle religion according to his conscience"; and he wished to establish a State-Church, but by agreement rather than by compulsion (Geffcken, *Church and State*, i. p. 440). In the *Instrument of Government*, § 37 (Dec. 16, 1653) toleration is limited (*a*) to those who "profess faith in God by Jesus Christ," (*b*) "so as they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others and to the actual disturbance of the public peace," (*c*) "provided this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as, under the profession of Christ, hold forth and practise licentiousness." Cp. W. H. Hutton, *The English Church from the Accession of Charles I.*, pp. 153 f.; Gee and Hardy, *Documents illustrative of English Church History*, p. 576.

[2] Cp. Lecky, *Rationalism*, ii. ch. iv. part ii., where Jeremy Taylor's work is described as "unquestionably the most important contribution of the Anglican Church towards toleration," with the one exception of Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants*. Jeremy Taylor's tolerance was certainly connected with his latitudinarianism. The fourteenth section of the *Liberty of Prophesying* contains a most interesting account of the history of persecution in the early Church, and in the twentieth the toleration of Romanism is defended. His later view is expressed in *Ductor Dubitantium*, book iii., and was influenced by his servility towards the restored monarchy (Taylor Innes, *Church and State*, p. 190). Even there, although he assigns the care of religion to the supreme magistrate, and would allow the magistrate to forbid any new religion, he deprecates persecution for private opinions (ch. iii. book iv.).

put the question on broader ground. He protested against the narrow limits within which toleration had been claimed in the interest of particular sects. Force, he argued, could never persuade; a Church was a voluntary society, and the care of souls was not committed to the civil magistrate more than to other men. Locke was in advance of his time; yet even he excluded atheists because their views were a solvent of reason and order.[1] The Toleration Act of 1689 only allowed a very meagre and circumscribed religious liberty. It did not tolerate Unitarians or Roman Catholics, and nonconforming ministers were obliged to subscribe the XXXIX. Articles, with certain exceptions. The Act was a real step forward, but it contained no assertion of the true principle of the voluntary character of religion, and it was not until the nineteenth century that toleration was practically completed in Great Britain by the abolition of religious disabilities for every creed;[2] for

[1] Locke's *First Letter on Toleration* was meant both to vindicate, and to show the imperfection of, the Toleration Act. Locke strongly emphasises the voluntary nature of the Church. "Nobody is born a member of any Church. . . . No man by nature is bounden to any particular Church or sect, but everyone joins himself voluntarily to that society in which he believes he has found that profession and worship which is truly acceptable to God." He explicitly repudiates the idea that "the magistrate" should suppress idolatry, arguing that there is no sure criterion of what constitutes idolatry. As regards atheists he writes, "Those are not to be tolerated who deny the being of God. . . . The taking away of God, though but even in thought, dissolves all."

[2] 1 William and Mary, c. 18. The object of the Act is stated in the opening words—"to unite their Majesties' *Protestant*

it must not be forgotten that true toleration involves not only freedom from actual persecution, but refusal to employ any temporal advantage or disadvantage as a motive to, or deterrent from, any religious belief or system. Locke's writings and the English Toleration Act exercised a wide influence in Europe. More powerful still was the influence exerted by the two great French writers, Bayle and Voltaire, the precursors of the French Revolution; nor can any Christian remember without a feeling of shame that the most complete and crushing condemnation of the principles of coercion was allowed to come from sceptical writers who were the bitterest opponents of Christianity. Bayle directed a special attack against St. Augustine and his application of the text, "Compel them to come in"; Voltaire re-

subjects in interest and affection," and the Act contains a clause specially excluding "any papist or popish recusant whatsoever, or any person who shall deny in his preaching or writing the doctrine of the blessed Trinity."

It was seven years after the Act of Toleration that the last execution for heresy took place in Great Britain — that of Aikenhead, at Edinburgh, in 1696. Space forbids us to trace the gradual removal of tests and disabilities in England, or the survival of the penal laws against Roman Catholics in Ireland, or the persecution of the Episcopalians in Scotland during the eighteenth century. We may regard our present condition as one of almost complete toleration in practice; in theory, the exclusion of Roman Catholics from the throne and from a few high offices, and the letter of the laws against blasphemy, impair its completeness; but modern decisions appear to confine the operation of the blasphemy laws to cases where the attack on Christianity is offensive or indecent.

viewed the whole history of persecution, and roused the conscience of Europe against the system. The force of his terrible indictment was proved in the anti-Christian outburst of the French Revolution.[1]

While the principle of toleration was thus being developed, both theoretically and practically, during the period between the Reformation and the French Revolution, there ensued also a long conflict of opinion on the relations between the Church and the Civil Power. It has been remarked with truth that, although the Reformation was a religious movement in origin and in intention, its immediate result was the secularisation of life and an increase in the power and prerogatives of the State.[2] In the universal Church-State of the Middle Ages the Pope had generally been regarded as the ultimate superior. He had usually been the aggressor in the conflicts with the Empire, and the power of the Emperor, the acknowledged temporal head of

[1] Some account of Bayle's work, *Contrains-les d'entrer*, is given in the Appendix to lecture iv., Note A, pp. 377, 378.

It should be noticed that Voltaire's most violent attacks on Christianity date from 1762 onwards, *i.e.* from the time of "the Calas tragedy," an account of which is given in Mark Pattison's *Essays*, vol. ii. (No. xv.). It was this horrible act of intolerance which stimulated Voltaire to attack the system; and however great were his faults and vices, it must be set down to his credit that he did more to destroy persecution than any other man (Lecky, ii. *loc. cit.*). Cp. Morley, *Voltaire*, ch. v.: "Voltairism can only be fairly weighed if we regard it as being in the first instance no outbreak of reckless speculative intelligence, but a righteous social protest against a system socially pestilent."

[2] Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, pp. 62, 81.

Christendom, had been of a shadowy and ineffective kind. The Protestant theory, in making the nation the unit, subjected the ecclesiastical power to the "godly prince," and the godly prince had at hand far more effective means of controlling a national Church than any Emperor had ever found of controlling a Pope whose spiritual authority extended over Western Christendom. Hence the Reformation caused a marked change in the direction of Erastianism, *i.e.* the control of the spiritual society by the civil. The spiritual power could no longer hope to control the secular, and the idea of the distinctness of the two powers and of the possibility of their forming a "contract" one with the other did not immediately emerge. Theories are apt to mould themselves to the shape of existing conditions; men, and especially Englishmen, often act first and evolve a theory afterwards; and so the new situation produced a school of divines and jurists whom we may call for convenience "Erastian."[1] Among them must be numbered at least one who was certainly not chargeable with taking a low or unspiritual view of the nature of the Church. Hooker's view of the relation of Church and State is vitiated by two unsound principles. The first is his reliance on the precedent of the Jewish theocracy, "the pattern of God's own ancient elect people"; the second is his conviction that the Church and the Commonwealth were absolutely co-extensive,

[1] On the use of the term "Erastianism," see Appendix Note C, p. 392.

and that no man belonged, or could belong, to the latter who did not belong to the former also. Hooker fought gallantly to maintain his position against Cartwright, who assailed it on one side, and against writers like Cardinal Allen, who attacked it on the other; but it is interesting to find that he traces back this identification of citizens and Churchmen not to any New Testament principle, but to the time when "whole Rome became Christian, when they all embraced the Gospel, and made laws in the defence thereof."[1] From a strictly legal point of view, perhaps, Hooker was accurate in maintaining the identity of churchmen and citizens in his own day, but even then the theory was breaking down before the steady advance of Nonconformity; and the development of religious

[1] Cp. Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* book viii., which controverts the Puritan assertion "that unto no civil prince or governor may be given such power of ecclesiastical dominion as by the laws of this land belongeth unto the Supreme Regent thereof." In ch. i. 2 he writes: "Seeing there is not any man of the Church of England, but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth; nor any man a member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England." The other phrases referred to occur in ch. i., sections 4 and 7. In the same chapter (section 3) he directly controverts the argument of Cardinal Allen's *Apologia*, that the Church ought to have "a spiritual regiment without dependence," "live she amongst heathens or with Christians" (Allen, *Apologia pro sacerdotibus Societatis Jesu*, 1583, ch. iv. pp. 64, 65). The argument from the Old Testament is stated fully in ch. iii.: "If, therefore, with approbation from heaven the kings of God's own chosen people had in the affairs of Jewish religion supreme power, why not Christian kings like power also in Christian religion?"

divergencies and of legal toleration has robbed his theory of almost everything but historical interest. The same may be said of two thinkers whose Erastianism was derived from very different premisses —Hobbes and Spinoza. Hobbes explained his *Leviathan* as "the Commonwealth, ecclesiastical and civil"; he maintained the absolute obedience of the subject to the sovereign in religious no less than in civil matters; in his view the sovereign was not only the head of the Church, but the "supreme pastor"; and if the sovereign were a heretic, his subjects would be equally bound to obey. True that the obedience need only be external, because "faith is internal and invisible"; but Hobbes seriously argued that this external profession could be separated from the real internal belief.[1] It sounds to us like a wilful *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory of enforced conformity; yet the same distinction between belief and profession commended itself to Spinoza, who was content to say that the

[1] Hobbes, *Leviathan*, cp. especially ch. xlii., "Of Power Ecclesiasticall." "If it be further asked, 'What if wee bee commanded by our lawfull Prince to say with our tongue, wee beleeve not; must we obey such command?' Profession with the tongue is but an external thing, and no more than any gesture whereby we signifie our obedience; and wherein a Christian, holding firmely in his heart the Faith of Christ, hath the same liberty which the prophet Elisha allowed to Naaman the Syrian" (Clarendon Press Reprint, p. 387). In the essay prefixed to this reprint Mr. Pogson Smith wrote: "Many of us—most of us, in fact—are Erastians with certain limitations: Hobbes was an Erastian without limitations" (p. xxx.).

mind of the individual belonged to himself, while the outward worship was the affair of the State.[1] Beside these extreme speculations the Erastianism of Erastus himself, of Althusius, and of Grotius may seem moderate; but the Dutch school of writers had a strong influence on European thought, and they were deeply imbued with the belief in the omnipotence and essential sanctity of the State, while they had lost all sense of the spiritual independence and corporate authority of the Church.[2] To them a Christian commonwealth meant (Dr. Figgis writes) "not a Church with civil officers . . . but a State with ecclesiastical among other ministers."[3] They held with Aristotle that the

[1] Spinoza, *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*, ch. xix. (ed. 1674, p. 308) "ostendere volo Religionem vim juris accipere ex solo eorum decreto qui jus imperandi habent; et Deum nullum singulare regnum in homines habere, nisi per eos qui imperium tenent, et praeterea quod Religionis cultus et pietatis exercitium Reipublicae paci et utilitati accommodari, et consequenter a solis summis potestatibus determinari debet. . . . Loquor expresse de pietatis exercitio et externo Religionis cultu; non autem de ipsa pietate et Dei interno cultu; . . . internus enim Dei cultus et ipsa pietas uniuscuiusque juris est, quod in alium transferri non potest."

[2] For an account of Althusius and Grotius, of whose works I cannot claim any first-hand knowledge, I must refer to Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, lecture vii.; Taylor Innes, *Church and State*, p. 162. The work of Grotius, which specially deals with the ecclesiastical question *De imperio summarum potestatum circa sacra*, was not published until after his death. Grotius drew a distinction between "*in sacris*" and "*circa sacra*." Althusius' work, *Politica methodice digesta*, is rated very highly by Dr. Gierke and Dr. Figgis.

[3] Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, p. 210.

object of the State was not merely "life," but "good life"; and religion being an important element in good life, the State should see that it is provided for her citizens, just as in modern times it sees to the provision of education or to the observance of sanitary regulations.

Erastianism was thus strong among seventeenth-century theorists, and in practice it laid powerful hold upon the countries in which the Reformation was victorious. Yet throughout the same period the opposite principle, that of the independence of the spiritual power, was also finding expression and gaining adherents. Its earliest champions seem to have been Presbyterians. The Presbyterians, indeed (like the Calvinists in Scotland), were not averse from using the secular arm so long as they were in a majority and the civil power was friendly. When they were in a minority and the civil power was hostile, it became a different matter. Thus it fell out that in England under Elizabeth, Thomas Cartwright (Hooker's great adversary) maintained the distinctness of the spiritual society from the civil.[1] His view was widely adopted by the Presbyterians, who were far more "ecclesiastically minded"

[1] *Id. ibid.* p. 73. Hooker appears to be controverting Cartwright, as well as Allen, in *Eccl. Pol.* viii. 1, 2, where he speaks of those who "make a necessary separation perpetual and personal between the Church and the Commonwealth," and "tie all kind of power ecclesiastical unto the Church." So Whitgift, in answering Cartwright's *Admonition*, says, "Methinks I hear you whisper that the prince has no authority in ecclesiastical matters" (Hooker, ed. Keble, iii. p. 328, edn. 3).

than the followers of Luther; and a somewhat similar view was maintained even more strongly by Robert Browne, the founder of the Independents.[1] The Congregationalist principle, which Browne and his followers adopted, would not harmonise with any principle of State authority, and this is true in an even greater degree of the individualism of the Society of Friends, who maintained the entire spirituality of the Church, while they condemned all external organisation.[2] In this way the growth of Nonconformity and the multiplication of sects

[1] Figgis, *op. cit.* p. 117: "The originality of Browne consists in his recognition of the futility of expecting his religious system ever to be universally imposed (this separates him from the ordinary Puritans), and in his clear enunciation of the private and individual nature of belief." Browne's theory of Church and State is shown in his brief *Treatise of Reformation without Tarrying for Any* (1582). Only three copies of the original are known, but a convenient reprint has been published by the Congregational Union. Cp. p. 13: "In deede can the Lorde's spirituall government be no waye executed but by the civill sworde, or is this the judgment that is written (Psal. 149), 'Such honour shall be to all his Saintes?' . . . Beholde nowe, doeth not the Lorde's Kingdome give place unto theirs? And doe they not pull doune the heade of Christe Jesus (Col. i. 18) to sett uppe the hande of the Magistrate?"

[2] Dr. Hodgkin points out that it was not Episcopacy so much as Puritanism against which George Fox revolted (*George Fox*, p. 4). The fundamental principle of Quakerism (if the term may now be used without offence) is the doctrine of the Inward Light, thus described by William Penn: "That God, through Christ, hath placed His Spirit in every man to inform him of his duty, and to enable him to do it, and that those who live up to this are the people of God" (quoted by Dr. Hodgkin in *Our Churches and why we belong to them*, p. 170).

counteracted, to an increasing extent, the prevalent Erastianism. Unhappily, in England the Church was largely identified with Erastian principles, and the vindication of spiritual independence was thus mainly left to sectaries, who combined the defence of this great truth with an unscriptural disregard of Church order and unity, or with the rigorous narrowness of the Puritan discipline.

But the vindication of spiritual independence produced an effect beyond the borders of Puritanism. We saw that Hooker had to contend alike against the Puritan Cartwright and against Cardinal Allen; and we find the Presbyterian theory, or something like it, echoed in an unexpected quarter, when the Jesuit writers develop their doctrine that both the Church and the State are *societates perfectae*, and that the two societies are entirely separate and independent of each other. Hence their relations must be those of "contract," not of supremacy on one side and subjection on the other.[1] This theory

[1] The remarkable influence of the Jesuits on the theory of the relations of Church and State is well described by Figgis (*From Gerson to Grotius*, lecture vi.). They emphasised "the difference between ecclesiastical power which springs from above, and civil which springs from below." Hence "the absolutely secular character of their conception of the secular power" is a feature of their teaching. This dichotomy was in strong contrast to the ordinary Lutheran or Anglican doctrine of the time. For the meaning of *societas perfecta*, cp. the definition quoted by Bishop Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 345 *n.*, "quae est in semetipsa completa, adeoque media ad suum finem obtinendum sufficientia in semetipsa habet." What was new in the theory of some of the Jesuit writers was not so much the claim that the Church was a

of contract was also propounded by Bishop Warburton in the eighteenth century. He defended establishment, but he maintained that the alliance was a free contract, which either side could terminate when it ceased to be for its advantage.[1]

What, it may be asked, is the drift of all this arid disquisition? Has this long discussion of the theory of Church and State any practical value? I do not think that it is fanciful to believe that the Erastianism which was so widely accepted in principle, and which in practice gripped both the Church of England and German Lutheranism so tightly after the Reformation, did really exercise a deep and far-reaching influence upon the spiritual life of the nation. It is the fashion to whitewash in turn every historical character and every period, and the eighteenth

societas perfecta, as the admission that the State also was the same (Figgis, p. 236). It is erroneous, as Dr. Figgis points out, to suppose that the *societas perfecta* theory dates only from the nineteenth century (p. 233).

[1] Warburton's work was entitled *The Alliance of Church and State*, and was first published in 1736 (see especially book ii. chs. i.-iii.). A summary of it may be found in Watson's *Life of Bishop Warburton*, ch. iii. The contract between Church and State was, in his view, parallel to the "social contract" by which the individual man, in submitting to membership in civil society, relinquished some of his individual rights. Thus the Church obtained protection and support from the State, acknowledging in return that the civil power was superior. The mould in which the thought of this work is cast is, as Mark Pattison remarked, "the politician's view of religion" (*Essays*, ii. p. 124). Warburton regarded our own system as the most perfect of all "Christian Establishments" (*Alliance*, book ii. ch. iv.).

century has not escaped the process. But the result as applied to religion in England in the eighteenth century is not convincing, and is not likely to be permanent. Whatever deductions and reservations we may make, it was, broadly speaking, for the Church of England a time of spiritual deadness and coldness, of servility and legalism, of low ideals and materialistic standards. "Enthusiasm," even in the more modern sense of the word, is repressed or discouraged; the voice of the Church is silenced; the bishops are more like State officials than fathers in God; the inferior clergy imitate the worldliness of their superiors; "the hungry sheep look up and are not fed," and steal away in consequence to other sheepfolds. There is an absence of vision and of high aims. Religion tends to sink into good citizenship, or cold morality, or stiff orthodoxy, or latitudinarian indifference. The more earnest-minded men are found in large numbers outside of the Church, and the most potent spiritual movement of the century was not allowed to find scope within her borders. I do not think that this picture is overdrawn; and if it be a true one, can we say that the result was unconnected with the principles on which the Church was acting? If the Church is viewed merely as a function of the nation; if churchmanship is merely an aspect of citizenship; if the practical control of the Church is in the hands of a Walpole or a George the Second, or of their congenial nominees upon the episcopal bench; if the interpretation of her laws is confided to the acumen of secular lawyers,—is it not

natural that the prevalent ideals of the Church under such conditions should be legalism, respectability, material comfort, rather than enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, and holiness? You cannot thus subject the spiritual society to the secular without depressing its ideals and robbing it of its motive power. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." [1]

[1] Bishop Butler's lament over the utter decay of religion in his own time is too well known to need quotation (cp. the Advertisement to the *Analogy* and the Charge to the clergy of Durham). Among other writers who give a dark picture of the religious life of their own generation it is enough to mention William Law, John Wesley, and Crabbe. But if these estimates are thought to be unduly pessimistic, the abuses which remain on record afford sufficient evidence of the absence of zeal and the prevalence of worldly selfishness. A good account of them may be found in Abbey and Overton's *English Church in the Eighteenth Century*. In answer to the question, "Why did faith become cold, energy dull, and enthusiasm sink to be a word of contempt?" one chief cause, at all events, must be sought in the fact that "the steady pressure of the Government was uniformly exercised against activity in the Church of England until the accession of George III." (Wakeman, *History of the Church of England*, ch. xviii.). This depressing influence was exerted in many ways, *e.g.* in the silencing of Convocation, in the episcopal appointments in England, and in the refusal to allow bishops to be consecrated for work beyond the seas. The low level of religious thought in England during the period is strikingly described in Mark Pattison's *Essays*, vol. ii. No. xiii.

It was not only in England that the eighteenth century was a period of religious torpor and ecclesiastical abuses. The same conditions prevailed also in France, Germany, and Scandinavia.

As an instance of a more favourable estimate of the religion of the eighteenth century, I may refer to Dr. Fremantle's *Bampton Lectures* (2nd ed.), pp. 242-243.

Let us, in conclusion, try to form some estimate as to how far the Reformation brought about a return to the principles of the New Testament in regard to matters of primary importance, such as the obligation of individual discipleship and the relations between the Church and the World. In the revolt against mediaevalism and external religion Luther and other leaders of the Reformation laid a stress upon individual faith and individual choice, which was, in the main, right and true, though it was capable of distortion. Individual conviction is the first step, though it is far from being the last, in vital religion. This has always been the strength of Protestantism; it was its great strength in the sixteenth century. The first generation of Protestants believed intensely, and valued their beliefs. Religion was the great interest of life; it occupied the greater part of the world's stage, and predominated over secular affairs in men's private lives. The tens of thousands of sixteenth-century martyrdoms attest the reality of these men's faith; and although sometimes it may seem as if the Protestant martyrs loved God less than they hated superstitious vanities, the ultimate motive even of their hatred was fidelity and obedience to what they held to be the Divine will. *They really cared*, and therefore they were able to make way against the persecutor. They brought about a great religious revival outside the limits of the ancient Church, and they stimulated the Church which they left to purify itself by the Counter-Reformation. But as a power for the conversion of the world, the

Reformed Churches (using the expression in the wider sense) were crippled by defects in other directions. They had a very imperfect grasp of the true nature of the divine society. They were attracted by the idea of an Invisible Church, and undervalued the necessity of corporate unity and historic continuity.[1] Thus the Protestant theory lent itself to an exaggerated nationalism and insularity, by which Christendom has been divided into separate compartments with little or no intercommunication or mutual understanding. Nationalism led on easily and naturally into Erastianism, as the religious community in each nation found itself unequal to the assertion of its spiritual independence; and Erastianism chilled religious life, not in England only, but in Germany, in Holland, and, I believe, in Scandinavian countries. And when once the vital conviction of the unity of the divine society had disappeared, individualism or congregationalism could run riot. The former led to the depreciation of all corporate religion, and to the reduction of religion to a personal sentiment or to private interpretation of the Bible; the latter is responsible for the sectarianism with which the Anglo-Saxon race, above all others, is painfully familiar. Thus the general result has been the disintegration of Christendom into a state of mischievous disunion, in which the effective force of the Church as an instrument for the conversion of the world is half paralysed by its internal incoherence. Three centuries have passed

[1] See Appendix, Note A, p. 389.

since the main work of the Reformation was accomplished, and it is true that those three centuries have witnessed an immense advance in the slow but lasting establishment of religious liberty. Yet that liberty has been secured at a heavy price, and has brought with it a large measure of confusion. Alike in countries which still acknowledge the Roman obedience and in those which have rejected it, the spiritual society (or the fragments which represent it) seems unable to put forth its full powers, and to adapt itself to new and complex conditions. The Church is still faced by the old problem of the things of Caesar and the things of God; and while experience has taught her that she can no longer cling to the mediaeval principle of enforced conformity and absolute co-extensiveness with the World, she has not yet substituted for it any clear principle of discipleship, but seems to halt between different opinions in the determination of her relations with the World. Yet never had the World greater need of the Church. And the Church, we believe, is still "the Spirit-bearing body"; and the Spirit of the Lord, which should be the pledge of liberty, proceeds from Him who is not a God of confusion, but of peace.

LECTURE VII

THE RELIGIOUS CHAOS OF TO-DAY

ONE only way to Life ;
One Faith, delivered once for all ;
One holy band endowed with Heaven's high call ;
One earnest, endless Strife ;—
This is the Church the Eternal framed of old.

Smooth open ways, good store ;
A Creed for every clime and age,
By Mammon's touch remoulded o'er and o'er :
No Cross, no war to wage,—
This is the Church our earth-dimmed eyes behold.

JOHN KEBLE, in *Lyra Apostolica*, No. c.

VII

THE RELIGIOUS CHAOS OF TO-DAY

Acts i. 6-8: "They therefore, when they were come together, asked him, saying, Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority. But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight."

Our Ascensiontide services fitly remind us of a primary duty of the Church—the duty of witness. In the Epistle for Ascension Day, in the Gospel for to-day,[1] this duty is emphasised. My text contains the last recorded words of Christ on earth, His parting charge to the officers of the divine society which He was leaving behind Him. With the help and guidance of the Holy Spirit they were to be His witnesses throughout the world—witnesses to His Incarnation, to His life and His death, to His Resurrection and His Ascension; witnesses to His teaching, His example, the power of His name, and

[1] The lecture was delivered on the Sunday after Ascension Day, and the text occurs in the Gospel for Ascension Day.

the redemption offered in that name to all mankind. On the strength of conviction with which the Apostolic Church maintained this primary duty of witness, we need not now dwell: we noticed it in the first lecture, and it is written large across the Acts and the Epistles. The duty was one which was primarily laid upon the eleven apostles: "Ye also (*i.e.* the apostles as well as the Holy Spirit) bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."[1] The apostles had been the companions of Christ in the days of His flesh: their eyes had seen Him and their hands had handled Him: they were the eye-witnesses of historic facts in His life. And the time soon came when the apostles passed away. When St. John died the generation of eye-witnesses became extinct. But the Church's duty of witness was not extinguished with the passing of that first generation. With unfaltering conviction the Church acknowledged the abiding duty of bearing witness to her master, by guarding the deposit of faith, by handing on the apostolic tradition, by preserving her unity and integrity as a divine society, and by showing the transforming power of her creed in the way of life and in the standards of conduct which she maintained in the midst of a hostile world. Every Christian was a witness individually, and the Church was the great corporate witness; and those to whom constancy and opportunity gave the privilege of sealing their

[1] St. John xv. 27. It is not certain whether μαρτυρεῖτε in this passage is imperative or indicative.

testimony by death were the witnesses *par excellence*, the "martyrs." The witness was united, emphatic, and coherent; and the Church grew and spread because multitudes of men outside her borders saw that the testimony of her members was indeed true.

This duty of witness was no transitory injunction. If there be such a thing as the Church, witness is the duty of the Church in every age, and the Church in every age must be prepared to answer the question how she is discharging it. How, then, is the Church discharging it to-day? That is the question to which I should like to attempt some answer in the present lecture. I have entitled this lecture "The Religious Chaos of To-day." Believe me, I have done so not from any wish to indulge in a sensational headline, but because I am convinced that the description corresponds to the facts. I know that I am laying myself open to the charge of pessimism. Indeed, some friendly criticism has already reached me to that effect. With regard to this I would plead, in the first place, that the real question is not whether the argument which I have submitted is unwelcome, but whether it is true to the facts: if it is untrue, it will very soon crumble away; but it is by the facts, and by them alone, that it should be judged. And I do not think that to face unpleasant facts is really pessimism. A medical man is not a pessimist when he pronounces his patient to be ill, or even to be *in extremis*, but only when he does so needlessly and on insufficient grounds, *e.g.* when he mistakes a curable disease for

an incurable one. Now the argument which I have tried to put before you, and to which many of you have patiently listened on the last few Sundays, is not that the Church is doomed to perpetual ineffectiveness, but that she has lost much of her effective power of witness owing to her own shortcomings and mistakes, and especially owing to that departure from sound policy in her relations with the world which began in the fourth century, and from the effects of which she is still half-unconsciously suffering. I have tried to illustrate this argument by considering different stages or periods of her work — the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire, the conversion of the barbarian races, the mediaeval system of the Papacy and the Empire, and, lastly, the Reformation with its effects in the direction of Nationalism and Erastianism. In doing so, I have necessarily dwelt chiefly on the darker side of things. That is generally the case with the historian. "Happy is the nation which has no history"—for history gives much of her attention to wars and conflicts, and is apt to pass more lightly and rapidly over periods of prosperity and uneventful calm. Or, to return to a medical metaphor, medicine is largely occupied with pathology; and, if we read much medical literature, we might imagine it impossible for any human being to enjoy a day's health: and yet, in spite of microbes and diseases innumerable, the race survives and multiplies. I tried, moreover, to indicate, on more than one occasion, that there was another side of

things which must be taken into account—*e.g.* the "diffusive" influence of Christianity, the moulding of law and social custom upon Christian principles, the spread of Christianised thought in literature and art, the prevalence of hopes and ideals founded on Christianity. In countless ways the world has been made richer by Christianity, in spite of all mistakes and shortcomings; and it is the same to-day. There *is* a state of religious chaos, I fully believe; but, in asserting that, one need not ignore much sincere earnestness, and much vigorous life and fruitful activity, which exist in spite of it. Do not misunderstand me, therefore, if again to-day I seem to be dwelling mainly upon mistakes, and defects, and hindrances to the full development of the mission of the Church.

That there exists to-day a great variety and discord of religious opinion in Christendom is a fact beyond dispute; there is not merely the divergence of one nation from another, but the divergence of conflicting religions in the same nation and the same district. Never, perhaps, in the history of the world has there been religious diversity on so large a scale. In pre-Christian religions the nation or State was the unit; within that unit there was solidarity, not individualism: religion was national. So it was in Greece and Rome, so also with Judaism, and with Oriental religions such as the Assyrian and Egyptian, in spite of all the local varieties of polytheistic worship.[1] The early Christian Church, on

[1] Cp. lecture i. p. 12. For the general character of Semitic

the other hand, was catholic and cosmopolitan, and cut across national distinctions; but within the Christian community itself unity of doctrine and a sufficient measure of uniformity in worship were maintained. Then, from the fourth century to the sixteenth, uniformity was enforced by law and by the civil power throughout Christendom, except for the divergence of East and West. The Reformation introduced a sort of national religious option, with coercion inside the national unit. That system has slowly broken down with the growth of toleration and the increasing diversity of belief. At the present day, in England, and generally speaking in civilised countries, we have freedom of belief and worship, with only a few relics of privilege or intolerance. This liberty in itself we believe to be right, for religious liberty is an essential principle of Christianity; yet the present condition, of which liberty is a contributing cause, is one which we may truly describe as chaos. We find, especially in England and the United States, an immense variety of religious bodies;[1] we find also a variety of relations between religious bodies and the State,

religion cp. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 28, 29. "Religion did not exist for the saving of souls, but for the preservation and welfare of society; and in all that was necessary to this end every man had to take his part, or break with the domestic and political community to which he belonged."

[1] See (*e.g.*) the statistics given in *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1909, for Great Britain and the United States. In the case of the latter country there appear to be over 150 religious bodies forming nearly 30 groups.

and an attitude of uncertainty on their part as to their relations with the World on such matters as compromise, separation, or comprehension. Outside the Roman communion there is a wide-spread tendency to disregard spiritual authority; and this often manifests itself in a purely individualistic form of Christianity, or in an undenominationalism which obliterates all sense of definite membership in the Church or in any religious body. Further, whereas it might have been expected that freedom to choose any or no form of religion would have resulted in an increase of sincerity and self-sacrifice on the part of those who freely decide to attach themselves to a particular religious body, and in the increased homogeneity and coherence of each religious body, this does not always appear to be the case in any marked degree. Thus Christendom is split up into separate communions—the Eastern Church with all its subdivisions, the Church of Rome, the Anglican Communion, and a large number of Protestant "Nonconformist" sects competing with one another in the same areas. In addition to these definitely Christian bodies we find a considerable and steadily increasing number of men who reject Christianity altogether as untrue or as improbable; and still more who are eclectic, and who accept whatever commends itself to them in Christian morality or doctrine without committing themselves to definite membership in the Church or in any religious body. Besides this we notice in the religious bodies themselves, or in many of them, a large mass of merely nominal

conformity without active membership; and, as contrasted with the sixteenth or earlier centuries, we observe a great secularisation of life and politics, of philosophy, literature, and thought. The religious interest no longer predominates over the secular, and there is an extremely common tendency to claim exemption for conduct and art and literature from the laws and discipline of the Christian Society, with which in theory most nations of Christendom are still connected by some kind of bond.[1] Such are some of the phenomena which seem to justify the use of the word "chaos" as applied to the religion of to-day.

Let us look a little more closely at England, and examine first the beam in our own eye; not that our view should be merely "insular," but because it may be more profitable to look first and most

[1] The secularisation of politics has been fully described by Mr. Lecky, *Rationalism*, ch. v. As to literature, thought, and social questions we have now reached a point at which it is impossible any longer to presume that the views expressed in books or newspapers, or in the drama, or in current conversation, will have any reference to the obligations of Christian morality. Illustration is almost superfluous, but for recent examples I may refer to the evidence given by many witnesses before the Committee on the Censorship of the Drama (1909); and to the evidence of the President of the Divorce Court and of many other witnesses before the Royal Commission on Divorce (February 1910). When questioned by the Archbishop of York as to the relation of his suggestions to traditional Christian views of marriage, Sir John Bigham replied, "I do not look at the question from a religious point of view at all" (*Times*, Feb. 28, 1910, p. 3).

anxiously in the direction where we can most easily verify our facts. What about our national Christianity and our national Church? In what sense is England Christian? We find, indeed, with thankfulness that there are very many whose membership in the Church (or in some religious body) is real and earnest; but we also find a larger number whose membership is negative and nominal, and implies no sense of obligation; in fact, if I were asked to point out the greatest weakness of the Church of England to-day, I should answer, "Not party spirit and divisions, mischievous as they are, but *membership without obligation*."[1] The great majority of the people are baptised, and like to have their children baptised; they prefer to be married in church; they desire Christian burial. They would resent their title to the name of "Christians" being in any way challenged, and they frequently describe themselves as Churchmen, merely because there is an Established Church and they do not definitely

[1] The evils arising from "membership without obligation" have been repeatedly pointed out by the Bishop of Birmingham; *e.g.* Gore, *Orders and Unity*, p. 72: "One of our first duties to-day is to make it plainly understood that to be a member of the Church must be understood to involve not only financial obligation, though it involves that, but also all that is implied in active membership of a society which is entrusted with an exacting message to a reluctant world." So also, *Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 190: "What we want is not more Christians, but, much rather, better Christians—that is to say, Christians who have more perception of what the moral effort required for membership in the Catholic brotherhood really is."

belong to any other religious body. The Church, in fact, is being utilised to a large extent as a machine for christening, marrying, and burying the population; and, as every parish priest in a large town knows by painful experience, the results are often far from edifying.[1] The indiscriminate baptism of children without sponsors and without the faintest probability that there will be any religious training in their homes; the religious celebration of marriages where there is no real Church membership or Christian belief; the claim for Christian burial with a solemn service which is unfitted for cases in which the dead man has flagrantly discredited the Christianity which he professed,—such things as these are of almost everyday occurrence; and the difficulties connected with them—and indeed

[1] The breakdown of the system of sponsors in large urban parishes, and the unedifying method of administering baptism promiscuously without sponsors, or with sponsors who have no idea whatever of spiritual responsibility, have been powerfully described by Canon Henson in a University sermon reprinted in *Apostolic Christianity*, pp. 319 f. He justly terms the present condition of things "indecent in itself, discreditable to the Church, and highly injurious to religion" (p. 330); and adds, "It is notorious that the indiscriminate use of the Prayer-Book Services for Marriage and Burial inflicts acute distress on many consciences; but so long as the mass of people, however morally and spiritually unworthy, are yet formally Christians by title of their baptism, it is extremely difficult to limit the use of these offices. It is not charity to indulge in the solemn mockery of their use in the cases where the assumption of Christianity cannot be reasonably made; it is grievous and baleful imposture" (p. 331).

with all Church work and discipline—are intensified by the conditions of modern society, where men are heaped together in great masses in our overgrown cities, and where there is a constant shifting of population.[1] Again, with regard to attendance at public worship, we must beware, no doubt, of making that the only test, but it will always be a valuable index. Accurate statistics are difficult to obtain, but there can be no doubt as to the general state of things. The last census of attendance at religious worship in London (the main conclusions of which the present Archbishop of York accepted as correct) showed that four-fifths of the population of Greater London were indifferent or hostile to all forms of public worship; and in a great proportion of our churches the sight of a genuine artisan would be so rare as to provoke remark.[2] Of those who

[1] It is obvious that where one or two clergy have to deal with a population of twelve or fifteen thousand, of whom (as is the case in not a few places) 25 or 30 per cent shift their abode every year, they must be dealing mainly with men and women of whom they can know but little, not (as the Prayer-Book contemplates) with those whom they know well. Parish priests in large cities are familiar with this difficulty, but its general significance as to Church discipline and membership has not yet been appreciated sufficiently by writers on Church questions.

[2] The results of the census of attendance at worship in London, undertaken by the *Daily News* in 1902-3, are given in Mr. Mudie Smith's book, *The Religious Life of London*, pp. 17, 18. The conclusion arrived at by Mr. Charles Booth (*Life and Labour in London—Religious Influences*, vol. vii. pp. 422 f.) was that the working class in London, as a whole, stands outside any organised religious body. The Archbishop of York in his *Opportunity of*

are baptised in the Church of England only a minority are confirmed, and Dr. Lang, in the book to which I have already referred, records, as the result of his experience in large cities, that among the working classes the definite choice of religion by coming forward for Confirmation constantly exposes a lad or a girl to ridicule and persecution at the hands, not of professed heathens, but of nominally Christian comrades.[1] Again, of those who are confirmed only a minority become or remain regular communicants; we have to take account of that strange and painful modern development, "non-communicant Churchmanship," which is (as Dr. Moberly truly describes it) "a travesty of New Testament Christianity," "a contradiction in terms," "a perpetual witness against Christ."[2]

the Church of England (written when he was Bishop of Stepney, in 1904) writes that, although there may have been some mistakes both in Mr. Booth's book and in the census, "as giving a broad statement of the existing situation, the main conclusion of these outlines cannot be seriously challenged." Nor is this state of things peculiar to London, for Dr. Lang adds that, as the result of some inquiries made by the Bishop of London in certain large centres of labour, it was found that only 1 per cent of workmen admitted that they belonged to any Christian body (p. 34).

[1] *Id. ibid.* p. 45. Canon Henson, from his experience in a large urban parish, estimated that only 25 per cent of the baptised are presented for Confirmation (*Apostolic Christianity*, p. 329).

[2] R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, pp. 300-1. The passage in which these words occur contains a most powerful indictment of our nominal and conventional Christianity, but is too long to be quoted here.

According to the official returns in the *Church Year-Book* for

In part, no doubt, this development is the result of prejudice and misunderstanding about Holy Communion, but it is also to a grave extent the product of a loveless indifference. Once more, to take another group of facts, what proportion of Churchmen make any real sacrifice for the maintenance of Church work—either a sacrifice of time or convenience in doing such work as teaching or visiting, or a sacrifice of money in supporting parochial or missionary objects? In most parishes there is a dearth of Church workers—a few members of the congregation are willing and active, but many more are drones, who regard Church work as the affair of the clergy alone. Subscription lists show the same result: a few who give generously and on principle, and many who give grudgingly, if at all, and only under stress of importunity, without any gladness in promoting the object in question, and without any conviction that their membership implies a claim on their income. How many, again, although they feel some faint interest in their own parish, are perfectly indifferent to the cause of Home or Foreign Missions, and tacitly, if not openly, question the necessity and the value of missionary work, and the duty of bringing the heathen into the kingdom of God! What pro-

1910 the percentage of *Easter* communicants to the total population varies in the different English dioceses from a little over 4 per cent in the case of Durham and Birmingham to just under 14 per cent in Hereford. For the whole country it could hardly exceed 7 per cent, and the percentage of regular communicants would be far smaller.

portion of middle-aged Churchmen, even of the educated classes, could give a coherent account of their faith, or of the Church, or attach any definite meaning to their Churchmanship, or acknowledge any claim on the part of the Church to exercise even the slightest measure of discipline upon their lives?[1] There is a general respect for the law of the State, and for the Decalogue, and a reluctance to come into conflict with public opinion; but the sense that Church membership involves special obligations beyond these limits is comparatively rare. There is a general idea that England is a Christian country, that an Englishman is a Christian, and probably a Churchman, unless otherwise labelled; but what is markedly absent is the idea of *discipleship* in the New Testament sense. That discipleship

[1] A large proportion of our Sunday churchgoers hardly get beyond the idea of *parochial* membership and obligation, if they reach that. They seldom have any knowledge of the nature, constitution, or organisation of the Church; many hardly know to what diocese they belong. This lack of knowledge and interest is reflected in the difficulty of finding qualified laymen to serve on diocesan committees, etc., and in the absence of a system of Church finance based upon the voluntary but regular self-taxation of all Churchmen. As regards discipline, it must be confessed that the Church of England is nearer to the laxity of Protestantism than to the authority of Romanism. The contrast between the two in this respect is instructively drawn out by Dr. Newman Smyth, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, pp. 15, 16: "Wherever Romanism is acknowledged it speaks with authority to the whole family. From the cradle to the grave, from baptism to the last unction, it consecrates and makes its own the life of man. . . . Protestantism has too seldom such inherent and inherited authority among its own free families."

involves, as we saw, the acceptance of Christ as Master by individual conviction and faith, and the taking up of the Cross at the cost of sacrifice; and, together with this, it meant also membership in a visible society which is distinct from the World, and imposes rules and obligations which are distinct from those of the World and of organised civil society. The absence of this idea of discipleship causes a general blurring of the line between Churchmen and non-Churchmen, and between Christians and non-Christians. There is at the same time a considerable movement of wholly anti-Christian thought, which carries on an aggressive propaganda, and which differs from the earlier Agnosticism of a man like J. S. Mill, because it not only questions the authority of Christian revelation, but hates and scorns the moral ideals of Christianity.[1] With this we are not now directly concerned; for it is an open enemy. But short of this we find a great vagueness of belief within and about our own borders. Some men have a moral sympathy with the Church and outwardly conform in worship, while questioning or rejecting fundamental doctrines such as the Incarnation or Resurrection; some go

[1] The difference between the attitude of John Stuart Mill, whose acknowledgment of the moral grandeur of Christ's character is too well known to need quotation, and that of Nietzsche and his English admirers, has been well brought out by Dr. Figgis in his Hulsean Lectures, *The Gospel and Human Needs*, lecture i. Cp. p. 11: "The new ethics discards the notion of love, ridicules sacrifice and pity, and pours a virulence of scornful hatred upon Christ himself."

further, and see clearly that religion must be corporate, but wish that the Church would lighten the ship by throwing overboard her cargo of dogma and mystery and miracle, and would carry instead a less dangerous and more marketable freight of science, philosophy, philanthropy, and common-sense. This is a view now widely current in cultivated circles, and it is advocated by some for whose character and moral earnestness one cannot fail to have the highest respect.[1] But it is less widespread and less formidable than mere indifference. The majority of men are neither hostile nor sceptical; they are simply not interested. Interest in Church work they regard as a matter for the clergy. But is there any wonder that under such circumstances the supply of clergy diminishes? We are familiar with the striking facts about the falling off in the supply of candidates for ordination,

[1] In his recent books, *Man and the Universe* and *The Substance of Faith*, Sir Oliver Lodge has made a sincere and reverent (though, I fear, impossible) attempt in this direction. He appears to leave the vital question of our Lord's divinity undecided: "I believe that the Divine Nature is specially revealed to man through Jesus Christ our Lord, who lived and taught and suffered in Palestine 1900 years ago, and has since been worshipped by the Christian Church as the immortal Son of God, the Saviour of the world" (*The Substance of Faith*, p. 132; Catechism, Q. 15). Even more far-reaching than these works are Dr. Stanton Coit's two volumes, *National Idealism and a State Church* and *National Idealism and the Book of Common Prayer*, which contain bold proposals for constructing a national Church and Liturgy on an ethical rather than a religious basis. Such a "Church" would be in no sense a Christian Church.

and we have had more than one inquiry as to the cause. Some observers attribute the decline to financial difficulties, others to difficulties of doctrinal belief.[1] Both these causes are doubtless at work, but the chief cause (I am persuaded) is simply *lack of interest*. A boy grows up in a nominally Christian home, and goes to a school where he imbibes a certain amount of information about the Bible and about Christian morality. Probably he leaves school or the University with a standard of honour, and a code of morals, and a sense of duty—and that is much to be thankful for; but the sense of membership, the enthusiasm of discipleship, are lacking; and when it comes to the choice of a career, we see wealth, comfort, distinction, adventure, intellectual interest, patriotism, easily turning the balance against a life of service in the cause of Christ. Religion, as it has been presented to him, has never gripped his heart or his will; it has given

[1] The Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider the Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders presented its Report in 1908. After summarising the causes of the falling off in numbers under three heads, theological, social, and financial, the Report proceeds: "We are convinced that the financial problem stands in the forefront of these causes" (p. 11). In a sense this may be true, but only in a qualified sense. The fact is that, owing to the lack of religious interest and grip in the wealthy or comfortable classes, the ministry is being recruited more and more from among the poorer classes, who cannot be trained without financial help. It is quite right that poor men should not be shut out from Holy Orders, but it is the apathy of the well-to-do which has made the question acute.

him neither an intense personal love for Christ, nor a keen sense of obligation to a divine society.

I will not weary you longer by accumulating more evidences of nominal Christianity and nominal Churchmanship. There is one objection which will, I know, be advanced against what I have been urging. It will be said that, although all this indifference and so forth does exist, it is only what we must expect in an imperfect world. Have we not been taught by Christ Himself to expect imperfection and inconsistency? will there not always be tares along with the wheat, and is it not only Puritanism which impatiently refuses to let them grow together until the harvest?[1] In this contention there is of course an element of truth; but is there not a real distinction between *imperfect* Christianity and *nominal* Christianity? Imperfect and inconsistent even the best Christians must always be; but is there not a vital difference between the imperfect discharge of a recognised and attempted duty, and the failure to recognise the duty at all, or to discharge it if it is recognised? Can any society, human or divine, flourish and develop, if membership in it involves so little obligation that men may claim rights without acknowledging duties, without ever realising what the rules and objects of the society are, and without contributing anything at all towards the achievement of its aims? And is not this great dead-weight of nominal membership too heavy

[1] For the bearing of the parable of the Tares upon this question, see Appendix, Note A, p. 395.

a burden for the Church to carry? Does not the consciousness of so much unreality drag her down to lower levels, quench her ardour, blunt her spirit, draw her into unworthy compromises, and cripple her power of witness? Who can deny that it is so?

Against this weakening of the sense of membership and of corporate Christianity there must be set what has been called the "diffusive" influence of Christianity, to which I have already alluded. This point was well brought out a few years ago in a thoughtful charge by the present Bishop of Southwark.[1] He made it clear that many causes had combined to weaken the corporate force of Christianity, while the diffusive force had gained in strength at its expense. Among such causes may be numbered the severance of ecclesiastical from political life, the increased freedom and diversity of religious opinion, the divisions and quarrels of Christian bodies, and the intellectual solvents of belief, which deter men from making a definite profession. Such things militate against corporate religion, but they may co-exist with a good deal of Christian sentiment and principle; and to deny all value to such influence, or to assert that it cannot produce good fruits in Christian conduct, would be a harsh and narrow and untrue view. We must take the diffusive influence for what it is worth, and confess with sorrow that the weakening of the cor-

[1] *The Church's Failure and the Work of Christ*, a charge to the clergy of the Diocese of Rochester (1903) by Dr. Talbot, afterwards Bishop of Southwark, and now (1911) Bishop-Designate of Winchester

porate influence has been in large measure due to the faults of Churchmen; but yet we may believe that the diffusive influence is, at the best, secondary and imperfect; by its very nature (as the Bishop of Southwark writes) it "shades off and grades down into what is not Christian at all"; "it knows little of the mighty strength of spiritual discipline; it can wield very imperfectly the great forces of loyalty and corporate conviction."[1] It falls very far short of the standards and ideals of the discipleship of the New Testament; and we may well doubt whether, if corporate Christianity became extinct, diffusive Christianity would long survive. Take away the heat from the centre, and the circumference will not long retain its warmth.

In connection with this question of diffusive influence we may touch briefly on the vexed question of Undenominationalism, the growth of which we might describe as the joint product of that influence and of the practical difficulties caused by religious divisions. The Undenominationalist seeks to solve those difficulties by making an abstraction of all points of difference, and (to use a metaphor from school arithmetic) he thus arrives at the "Greatest Common Measure" or "Highest Common Factor," which he then terms "fundamental Christianity." There is, however, and there can be, no proof that only that is fundamental which is accepted by all who call themselves Christians, nor must this "fundamental" Christianity be for a moment con-

[1] *Id. ibid.* p. 10.

founded with primitive Christianity; and, as applied by the State to education, Undenominationalism ignores the Christian society, and is carried on without reference to spiritual authority. It involves the commissioning of Christian teachers and the control of religious teaching by some secular authority; and it must either ignore the existence of bodies like the Unitarians and Agnostics, or else it must water down its teaching to suit their views. It tends to lay stress on a Christian (or quasi-Christian) ethical teaching, and to obscure the fact that Christianity involves membership in a spiritual society. It is therefore wholly and permanently impossible for those who lay stress upon the existence of such a society to accept it as a final or satisfactory solution of the difficulties which beset the question of religious education.[1]

[1] I do not wish to refer to the details of recent controversies about legislative proposals for the more complete establishment of State undenominationalism in our elementary schools, but I should like to recall a striking passage in which Dr. Moberly showed the unphilosophical, as well as the unjust and unpractical, nature of the undenominational principle:—

"Men think of undenominationalism as purely negative, as though it taught nothing at all about the things which it omits. On the contrary, it teaches that they are to be omitted; and this, in respect of such things as creeds, ministries, and sacraments, necessarily amounts to teaching that they are at the most immaterial; and this is hardly distinguishable, if distinguishable at all, in experience, from teaching that any earnest teaching about them is positively mischievous because positively false. . . . Undenominationalism, so far from being really unsectarian in character, is itself an instance of the sectarian spirit in its most exclusive and aggressive form. It is really of the nature of an attempt at a new denomination, more latitudinarian and rational-

I have been speaking mainly with reference to the Church of England, but more than once we have touched upon the question of disunion and religious divisions—"our unhappy divisions," as the Prayer for Unity truly terms them. The question of reunion is beset with difficulties which it is idle to ignore: we must glance at them again in the concluding lecture—here we can only record the fact of our divisions and the extent of the mischief. If we look at Europe generally, we find the great schism of East and West dividing Christendom into two halves, almost without intercommunication or mutual understanding. If we look at the position of the Church of England, we are conscious of our isolation. It is not so complete as it once was, neither are we so content with it; we may exchange courtesies with the East, we may follow with close interest the fortunes of the Church in France, or the policy of the Vatican with regard to Modernism; our theological scholars may be profoundly influenced by German investigations; here and there an individual divine may establish relations with the churches of Scandinavia;[1] but effective unity is not yet in sight,—we have not yet reached the stage of thorough mutual understanding, or even of fully realising the extent of the evil; yet Christianity, according to its earliest and best traditions, was

istic in basis, more illiberal, and persecuting in method, than any that before exists" (*Problems and Principles*, pp. 227-228).

[1] See Report No. xi. in the *Proceedings of the Lambeth Conference of 1908* (pp. 169 f.).

nothing if not cosmopolitan. Or we look to the still more pressing question within England itself, and we cannot fail to perceive the manifold sources of weakness in the present disunited state of English Christianity. There is an immense waste of spiritual energy, of men, money, and buildings; and an undignified and demoralising religious competition, in consequence of which unscrupulous people are found flitting about from one denomination to another for the sake of pecuniary help,[1] or from unworthy personal reasons; while social jealousies and mutual ignorance and misunderstanding estrange and embitter those who ought to be united in a common service, and cause the enemies of Christianity to blaspheme. Beyond all question, whatever the remedy may be, our unhappy divisions do sorely impede the effectiveness of our witness, and make for disintegration and chaos.[2]

When we turn from the question of our religious

[1] This point is emphasised in many places in the elaborate work compiled by Mr. Charles Booth, *Life and Labour in London —Religious Influences* (7 vols., 1902), and hardly needs detailed proof or illustration. The indexes to vol. vi. s.v. "Charity," and the summaries in vol. vii. (*e.g.* p. 294) will furnish evidence.

[2] Cp. Newman Smyth, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, pp. 21 f. In the letter addressed in 1905 to the ministers of all the Christian communities in England, signed by the two Archbishops and by the Presidents of the chief Nonconformist bodies, there is a clear recognition of "the paralysing effect upon the moral forces of Christianity which our divisions inevitably produce." The letter is reprinted by Bishop Gore, *Orders and Unity*, pp. 208-210. This recognition of the evils of division is in itself an advance upon the spirit which gloried in sectarianism.

divisions to look at the relations which exist at the present moment between religion and the State, we find, again, a condition of things which appears to be anomalous and transitional. There is freedom of belief and of worship, and only a few traces of religious disabilities still remain. The State does not subsidise any form of religion except in the case of services rendered to troops or to inmates of State institutions. The Nonconformist bodies and the Roman Catholics are organised upon a purely voluntary basis, and the State exercises no regulative power over them, save in so far as disputes about contracts or property may bring the interpretation of their Confessions, or of their trust-deeds, before the secular court. That is a necessity from which, as experience shows us, hardly any religious body has yet succeeded in escaping.[1] The Church of England, on the other hand, in virtue of her continuity, is in those special relations with the State which are generally described as "establishment."

[1] The most recent, and perhaps most conspicuous, instance of the way in which the possession of property by a "Free" Church may involve the examination of its doctrines by a civil tribunal is afforded by the well-known decision of the House of Lords in 1904 in the litigation between the "United Free Church" of Scotland and the (remnant of the) Free Church. During the trial the Lord Chancellor and his colleagues listened to intricate arguments concerning Calvinism and Arminianism, the Westminster Confession, and the Synod of Dort, and these arguments were reflected in their judgments (*Guardian*, August 3, 1904, p. 1274). It is, however, surely misleading to describe this judicial control of property as an illustration of the establishment of the Free Churches (see Clayton, *Church Defence*, p. 104).

"Establishment" is a term now acknowledged in legal documents, but I do not know that it has ever been defined by law. There is no single Act of Parliament by which the Church was ever "established," as by some Napoleonic Concordat; for in England the Church is, in a true sense, older than the State.[1] The Establishment of to-day (whatever value we may attach to it) is really only the pale ghost of the former close identification of Church and State in one society with an enforced uniformity which made them co-extensive. That condition has passed away, but a partial and ill-defined connection still remains, although piecemeal disestablishment has been going on for a long time. The State no longer gives grants for church-building; the power of levying Church rates has been abolished; in State schools no preference is given to Church teaching over any other form of teaching, but rather the reverse. The drift of things has

[1] Cp. *The Book of Church Law* (by Dr. J. H. Blunt, revised by Sir W. Phillimore and G. Edwardes Jones, pp. 8, 9): "The 'establishment' of the Church has been effected in reality by its gradual assimilation with our national life, and not by Act of Parliament." . . . "An actual 'establishment' has indeed been erected by express legislation in the case of the Presbyterian Establishment of Scotland; but a comparison of its creation by Act of Parliament with the historical continuity of the Church of England will at once show that the latter is not 'by law established' in the same sense." Yet although "establishment" has not been created by express legislation, the term describes the special relation in which the Church stands to the law, as compared with other religious bodies. Cp. Lord Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment*, pp. 10, 68 f.

long been towards the restriction of privilege. Apart from the precedence given to Archbishops and Bishops, and the presence of some of their number in the House of Lords, and of a chaplain in the House of Commons, or from the use of the Coronation Service, and from whatever social prestige or practical advantage may be derived from the recognition of the Church as "national," it is difficult to say what special privileges Establishment confers upon the Church. There are many people, however (and among them men of real religious earnestness), who value very highly the advantage of Establishment to the nation. They cling almost passionately to the principle of a national recognition of religion, and they prize the right to the ministrations of the parochial clergy which is secured to all the inhabitants of the land by the presence of an Established Church.[1]

Against privilege there must be set regulation and control. To enter fully into that subject would demand a separate lecture, and would involve the discussion of controversial questions which are not well fitted for treatment in this pulpit. It is enough for my purpose to mention a few points of practical importance.

[1] Cp. lecture viii. p. 329. Among recent writers who estimate very highly the religious advantages to the nation of an Established Church, reference may be made to Canon Henson (*The National Church*), Dr. Llewelyn Davies (who contributed the Preface to Canon Henson's book), the Bishop of Carlisle (Dr. Diggle), Mr. Arthur Elliot (*The Church and the State*), and the *Spectator* (*passim*).

During the last century the Church has frequently been hampered by the legislative control of Parliament, and she is hampered still. At the present moment, for instance, it is impossible to subdivide an overgrown diocese without the consent of a Parliament which is habitually overworked, generally indifferent, and sometimes unfriendly.[1] It is impossible, again, to change a rubric in the Prayer-Book without that consent, because the Prayer-Book is a schedule to the Act of Uniformity; and it is now being urged as a potent argument against rubrical changes that such changes would have to be discussed and sanctioned by the House of Commons.[2] In such matters as Church discipline and the removal of abuses connected with patronage and simony, necessary measures of

[1] The creation of the bishopric of Southwark was delayed until the matter was taken up by the Government in 1904, and the formation of the new sees of Essex and of Sheffield is blocked at the present time, no special facilities having been granted in the sessions of 1910-1911. The Bishoprics Bill, which passed the House of Lords in 1909, would enable the Church to form new bishoprics when they are required and when sufficient funds have been provided.

[2] Wherever there was a contest at the recent elections of Proctors in Convocation (1910-1911), it turned mainly on the question of Prayer-Book revision, and especially on the proposed changes in the use of the *Quicunque Vult*. Several of the anti-revisionist candidates urged the objection that any revision would involve a discussion of the Prayer-Book in Parliament. Such a discussion in Parliament would certainly be unseemly; but the lesson to be drawn is, not that revision is undesirable, but that a state of things in which Parliament can claim authority over the Prayer-Book is no longer tolerable.

reform were long delayed by malevolent obstruction in the House of Commons. In manifold ways the Church's power of self-government and adaptation to new conditions has been impeded by the need of the consent of Parliament.[1] On the other hand, Parliament has sometime acted not too slowly, but too hastily. In more than one case it passed legislation which vitally affected the Church without waiting for the assent of Convocation, and the laws in question, therefore, failed to bind the consciences of many Churchmen. The most notorious of these Acts, the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, caused great bitterness of feeling for a few years, and its procedure has long been practically abandoned as unworkable.[2]

In the judicial sphere the state of things is scarcely more satisfactory than in the legislative.

[1] The most notorious instance of obstruction deliberately used to prevent a needed Church reform was in 1892, in the case of the Clergy Discipline Bill. The Bill eventually passed "after what the Liberals themselves declared to be 'scandalous obstruction' on the part of the Welsh members, on whom Mr. Gladstone himself employed his influence in vain" (*Life of Archbishop Benson*, ii. 429). The object of the Bill was simply to facilitate the removal of immoral clergy (*ibid.* 402).

[2] The Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874 was described by Mr. Disraeli (then Prime Minister) as an Act "to put down Ritualism." Between 1874 and 1890 only seven or eight prosecutions took place under its provisions. Archbishop Tait in his later years recognised that the Act had not been successful, and one of his last anxieties was to prevent the case of Mr. Mackonochie from coming before the Courts (*Life of Archbishop Tait*, 3rd ed., vol. ii. pp. 227, 606).

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council never has been, and is never likely to be, universally recognised as a satisfactory Final Court of Appeal in spiritual matters; and even if disputes about ritual can be avoided, the action of the State in altering the Marriage Law without the consent of the Church threatens to be productive of constant friction. The last few days have brought us a striking illustration.[1] A secular court has been called upon to determine whether certain persons should or should not be admitted to communion at the altars of the Church, and has decided that in virtue of a recent Act of Parliament, they are admissible, and can legally enforce their claim to admission. The decision is subject to appeal, and I make no comment on its correctness. It may be perfectly sound in law for aught that I know. The point is that under existing conditions the law of the Church and the law of the State may be at variance, and that the law of the Church on such a question as the terms of communion may be

[1] This lecture was delivered a few days after judgment had been given by the Court of King's Bench in "Rex *v.* Dibdin," arising out of the case of "Banister *v.* Thompson." By a majority of two to one the Court decided that Canon Thompson had no right to repel from Holy Communion two persons who had contracted a marriage civilly legalised by the Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage Act, 1907. In his Judgment Mr. Justice Darling is reported to have said, "He was of opinion that this marriage, which before was contrary to the law of God, merely because the statute condemned it as such, was so no longer, and that by virtue of the statute which legalised it" (*Guardian*, May 26, 1909, p. 826).

overridden by the statute law as interpreted by a secular Court. Such a state of things must inevitably produce discord, but it is plainly part of the price which we are paying for Establishment under present conditions.[1] Other illustrations might be added, such as the right of every ratepayer to attend the vestry and to vote for churchwardens. This right is not largely abused in practice by non-Churchmen, but it tends to obscure the line between

[1] The decision of the majority of judges in the Court of King's Bench has since been affirmed by the unanimous judgment of the Court of Appeal, but it is understood that there will be a further appeal to the House of Lords. The judgments of the Lords Justices of Appeal deserve careful attention, in particular that of Lord Justice Fletcher Moulton. They have naturally caused pain and anxiety to Churchmen who are not prepared to accept the extreme Erastian position, an anxiety which will hardly be removed by the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Dr. Inge (*Guardian*, February 11, 1910, p. 215). Whatever were the exact circumstances of the suit in the Court of Arches, and whether or not the incumbent was well advised in going to the Court of King's Bench, the fact remains that the Civil Courts have (so far) declared that a parish priest has no longer the right to exclude from communion those persons whom previously he had a right to exclude, and this because the law of the State has been altered, while the rule of the Church remains the same. This is to make the State, not the Church, the arbiter of the law of God, and the judge of the terms of communion. Such a state of things may, without exaggeration, be called intolerable. As long ago as 1882 Archbishop Magee prophesied that "whenever the State treats, and requires the Church to treat, as married those whom the Church declares to be not married or marriageable, *then* will come a strain which will snap, or go near to snapping, the links that bind Church and State" (*Life*, ii. p. 170).

churchmanship and citizenship, as in fact do all the anomalous conditions which we have been noticing. And the obliteration of that line is just what the earnest Erastian desires, because he is sincerely convinced that the strength of the Church is derived from its intimate connexion with the State and its co-extensiveness with the nation, rather than from its own independent mission.

We have lingered so long over the conditions of religion in England, and of the Church of England in particular, that we have little time remaining for a more extended survey. Much might be said of English Nonconformity, which now claims to embrace half the nation.[1] It is natural that in bodies formed in comparatively recent times to vindicate some special principle there should be less nominal membership than in a body like the Church of England, but even here we sometimes meet with complaints of indifference and ineffective member-

[1] In the absence of a religious census no exact figures of religious profession can be given, and even if there were such a census, the results would have little real value. According to the official figures for 1909 the total number of communicants in the Evangelical Free Churches in England and Wales is 2,178,221. Sixteen different denominations are included, ranging from Wesleyan Methodists (611,847 communicants), Congregationalists (459,147), and Baptists (400,343) to small bodies such as the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion (2520) and the Free Church of England (1352). The number of Sunday School scholars is given as 3,416,377. The following statistics for the Church of England are given in *The Church Year-Book*, 1910:—Communicants at Easter, 2,231,753; Sunday Schools—number of scholars on the books, 2,494,227.

ship.[1] In the Church of Rome the principle of authority is vigorous, and discipline is not neglected, but the relations of the Roman Church with the State vary so greatly in different countries, and the conditions under which she works are so widely different, that it is not easy to generalise. Where, as in England, Roman Catholics are in a decided minority, membership is a more real thing, and nominal adherents are not so numerous; but in Latin countries, where Protestantism strikes no deep root, and where the choice lies between Roman Catholicism and irreligion, we generally find a large proportion both of very nominal adherents and also of men who are definitely hostile to the Church. France and Italy are the most obvious illustrations of this state of things. Recent French writers have drawn gloomy pictures of the rarity of "practising" Catholics in many parts of France, and the continuance in power of a Government so openly hostile to the Church which it has recently despoiled is a plain evidence of the numerical weakness of earnest and convinced Catholics in a country where Catholicism is (or, a little while ago, was) supposed to be the religion of the great majority of the inhabitants. There can be no doubt whatever of the prevalence both of apathy within and of hostility without; but in the Church of France the present

[1] I understand that among Wesleyan Methodists, for instance, there are some members who rarely or never attend class-meetings, and that, although disciplinary powers exist, they are seldom used to counteract slackness.

condition of poverty, almost of persecution, will at least have the effect of sifting the sincere from the indifferent.[1] In Eastern Europe the Orthodox Church has had a less eventful history: in Russia and in Greece its national character is strongly marked, and its connection with the State is very intimate. In Russia the relation of the Church to the Tsar and the constitution of the Holy Synod appear to Western eyes to be in theory and principle extremely Erastian; but competent writers maintain that the effect in practice does not entirely correspond to the theory. In countries which remain under Turkish rule the branches of the Eastern Church are forced to accommodate themselves to circumstances, and to accept Patriarchs

[1] Mr. Joseph McCabe's recent work, *The Decay of the Church of Rome*, although hostile and prejudiced, seems to give evidence of losses of membership which it is impossible to ignore, and in many cases he quotes the statements of Catholic writers. For a picture of Catholicism and anti-clericalism in France in the last decade of the nineteenth century cp. Bodley's *France* (2nd ed., 1899), book i. ch. ii. The weakness of the Catholic party at the polls is often explained away, but unconvincingly: it may be true that the anti-clericals are powerful out of proportion to their real numbers, but the present state of things would be impossible if sincere "practising" Catholics had been numerous. To remedy the extreme poverty of the disendowed clergy "diocesan funds" are being raised. At Annécy in 1909 the present writer met with an episcopal appeal to secure a stipend of £72 for each *curé* and £36 for each *vicaire*. For the condition of Catholicism in Italy and its struggle with anti-clericalism and socialism, see King and Okey, *Italy of To-day*, ch. ii.; and cp. *La Chiesa e i tempi nuovi*, by Mgr. Bonomelli, Bishop of Cremona, p. 31.

nominated by the Sultan. Their circumstances are exceptional; but of the Orthodox Church in Greece and Russia it may, I think, be said that, in spite of scepticism among the educated classes, religion there is of a more national type than in any Western country at the present time.[1] Finally, if we turn to those countries of the New World which have been peopled wholly or mainly by the Anglo-Saxon race, we find the religious diversities of England existing in a still more marked degree. The principle of an Established Church has either never been transplanted, or, where it has been tried, it has been abandoned: it is practically extinct except in India, where we find an exotic "establishment" for European Christians unequally yoked with a missionary Church for evangelising the heathen.[2] The United States, as the country in which there is the greatest mix-

[1] Peter the Great refused to appoint a successor to the Patriarch Hadrian, and after an interval substituted government by the Holy Synod, with a layman, nominated by the Tsar, as "Procurator." For this, and for the bureaucratic nature of the Russian Church, cp. Adeney, *Greek and Eastern Churches*, pp. 425-432; Mouravieff, *History of the Church of Russia*, chs. xv.-xvii. The nature of the dependence of the Russian Church upon the State was discussed by M. Khomiakoff in his correspondence with the Rev. W. Palmer in 1852 (Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, pp. 126, 127).

[2] The unhappy effects of Establishment and State control in India in cramping missionary effort and impeding the growth of any truly national Church, are explained in the Rev. C. F. Andrew's *North India*, 1908. The first Bishop of Calcutta went out "to govern an Established Church," and repudiated the idea that his chief duty was to encourage missionary work (p. 16).

ture of nationalities, and in which individualism has been carried to its furthest point, naturally presents the greatest diversity of conflicting religions, and affords a hospitable soil for the newest theologies and the most fantastic religious speculations.[1]

Enough has been said, if not to justify the use of the phrase "religious chaos," at all events to explain what I meant by the words. I meant something more than mere diversity of religious belief. That we have in abundance, especially in countries affected by the Reformation. But beyond the actual diversity of belief, we find a great confusion and uncertainty of principle. Old things have passed away, and we have to do our work under new conditions; but as yet we have hardly realised what those conditions are, or on what principles we must adapt ourselves to our new tasks. The mediaeval system of Church and Empire has vanished, the Reforma-

Indian bishops at the present day are most zealous for missions, but they are almost powerless to resist the influence of State predominance (p. 228). "The living, growing Church of the Indian people must no longer be at the mercy of dictation of a Secretary of State, 7000 miles away, both for the appointment of its chief bishops and the establishing of its bishoprics" (p. 226).

As regards the position of the Church in British colonies, in Barbados alone, I believe, does the Church continue to enjoy any measure of State recognition and endowment (see *Digest of S.P.G. Records*, 1701-1892, p. 205).

[1] The success of such religious impostures as Mormonism, Christian Science, and the teaching of the "prophet" Dowie, are only three conspicuous instances of the credulity which often accompanies the rejection of the principle of Church authority and unity.

tion ideal of enforced uniformity under a "godly prince" has followed it; we have accepted the principle of religious liberty and abandoned coercive methods. So far, well. But have we thought out the consequences of these changes? Is the growth of individualism to be unchecked? Can we view with acquiescence the indefinite multiplication of sects? If the coercive authority of the State is discarded, is there no other kind of authority which can help to mitigate the religious confusion? What is the ultimate effect of complete religious liberty on the recognition by the State of a national Church, and on the maintenance of a theory of "national religion"? Are we right, under our new conditions, in allowing membership in the Church to mean little or nothing, and churchmanship to be confused with citizenship? On these and other matters there seems to me to be a great confusion of thought; we appear to be drifting rather than sailing by a chart. We rightly accept and prize the principle of religious freedom; but men sometimes have strange ideas of what religious freedom implies. It must always imply the freedom to join or not to join the Church or any other religious body; and, having joined a religious body, to leave it again at any moment; but it surely does *not* imply any freedom to ignore the rules of the body and the obligations of membership while you still belong to it and claim its privileges. Yet that is the practical interpretation which many people put upon it. We watch the gradual drift of things in regard to the relations of

Church and State, which Sir Alfred Lyall described last year as "the judicial separation of Altar and Throne," rather than "a complete divorce";[1] but few people look at the question in the light of past history or of fundamental principles. We hardly appreciate the changes in the religious sphere which have been wrought by the establishment of democracy, or again—to look in a very different direction—by the solvent effects of Biblical Criticism upon a Protestantism which based itself solely upon the Bible.[2] We have abandoned coercive methods, but have we shaken ourselves entirely free from methods which may be called wholesale and indiscriminate, from temporal inducements, from unworthy compromises? Have we any settled policy as to whether the methods of the Church should be primarily *extensive* or *intensive*, whether (that is) quantity is to be preferred to quality, or quality to quantity? These are some of the difficulties which surround us at the present moment, and they are difficulties not only of speculative theory but of every-day experience.

[1] Presidential Address at the International Congress of Religions, 15th September 1908.

[2] Cp. Bishop Gore, *Orders and Unity*, p. 191. "The Old Protestant orthodoxy stood by the sole and final authority of the Bible as the infallible word of God. But it is exactly this position of the Bible which modern knowledge is making more and more impossible."

The loss of religious authority both in family life and over large areas of thought is powerfully described in Newman Smyth's *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, pp. 14-19.

For my part, I am convinced that, if the witness of the Church is to be effectively given, it can only be through Churchmen coming to have a clearer idea of what membership in the Church means, and of what ought to be the relations between the Church and the World. If the Church has a warfare to wage, and is to wage it without disaster, she must (at the least) be able to discern between friend, neutral, and foe. If we are ever to make disciples of all nations, we must not let the very idea of discipleship be evacuated of all force and meaning in the Christian body. When our Lord ascended up on high, and led captivity captive, He did not merely leave behind Him the memory of a noble life, or the tradition of a sublime teaching, but He gave gifts unto men. He gave them the abiding gift of an ordered society, which was to be for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the Body: through which they might attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, and the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

LECTURE VIII

THE FUTURE OUTLOOK

What, if to the trumpet's sound
Voices few come answering round?
Scarce a votary swell the burst,
When the anthem peals at first?
God hath sown, and He will reap;
Growth is slow when roots are deep.

JOHN KEBLE, *Lyra Apostolica*, No. clxviii

VIII

THE FUTURE OUTLOOK

St. Matthew xxviii. 18-20: "And Jesus came to them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

THIS morning we enter upon the last stage of our inquiry into the relations between the Church and the World. We began, you will remember, with the attempt to trace in the New Testament the intention of Christ for the Society which He was founding, and the relation in which He purposed that it should stand with regard to the World. In subsequent lectures we examined the relations of the Church and the World at certain critical periods of history; in the last lecture we tried to analyse the religious phenomena of our present-day experience, and we found abundant reason for characterising the existing condition of affairs as one of religious chaos. The object of the inquiry was (as I said at the outset) not merely historical or

speculative, but also practical. It was my hope that by comparing the original mission of the Church with the policy and methods which have been actually pursued at different periods, and again with the conditions which prevail to-day, some light might be thrown upon the problems which now perplex us and some guidance might be derived for their solution. The attempt may have been an audacious one. In so wide a historical survey as that which has been undertaken it is hardly possible that one who cannot claim to be either a theologian or a historian or a jurist should avoid all errors of detail; and in days when histories are written on joint-stock principles and with limited individual liability it may seem presumptuous for a lecturer to endeavour to trace the history even of an institution or a group of ideas throughout the course of many centuries. And yet, in spite of all the shortcomings of which I am painfully conscious in the treatment and presentation of the argument that I have laid before you, I cling to the belief that the main principles to which I have directed your attention are principles which have been very commonly overlooked, and which it is of vital moment that the Church should realise afresh.

I must not repeat to-day, or even summarise at any length, the conclusions which I put before you in the last lecture; but, assuming that in the main they were correct, and that there does now exist a condition of religious chaos, in which diversity of belief, disunion, lack of authority, absence of

discipleship and enthusiasm, nominal Christianity, and the want of any clear distinguishing line between the Church and the World are marked features,—assuming this, we now ask what prospect there is of finding a remedy for these troubles, and in what direction we ought to look for one. Those who have followed me so far will have anticipated the general lines of the answer that I shall suggest. The evils which we deplore are to a large extent traceable to the neglect of principles which we found to be laid down in the New Testament. In the place of an united Christian body with a clear line existing between it and the World, we find a disunited Christianity, with no clear line separating it from the World. If the Church is ever to recover power, it must be by a clearer appreciation of her Master's injunctions and a greater fidelity in observing them. There are, in the first place, those two fundamental principles of the divine method to which I called your attention—the principle that God respects human freedom, and the principle that God makes use of human instruments.[1] God respects human freedom. He refuses to coerce either man's will or man's intellectual faculties. He requires a venture of faith and a response of love; He does not want the soulless obedience of human automata. There is freedom to disbelieve and to disobey. The demand for some overpowering sign is condemned. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded

[1] See lecture i. pp. 13, 14.

though one rose from the dead." Those pregnant words from to-day's Gospel[1] are a significant warning against all religious methods which seek to take men's belief by storm or to wrest an unrealised compliance from their wills, against all use of wholesale or unworthy means, all religious bribery, and every method which seeks to commend religion by persuading men that it can be had without paying for it. And then there is the second principle, that God chooses to work through human instruments: that the treasure is preserved in earthen vessels. True that the gates of hell shall not prevail; yet the struggle will be long and tedious, and there will be mistakes, and failures, and defeats.[2] Although the Faith may have been

[1] St. Luke xvi. 31. This lecture was delivered on the First Sunday after Trinity.

[2] It ought to be said frankly that the argument of these lectures would be invalid if the Church is possessed of that degree of infallible guidance which is attributed to it by not a few members of our own communion. If the guidance granted to the Church through the Holy Spirit is of such a kind that one cannot suppose any custom or policy generally accepted by the Church to have been accepted on insufficient grounds, then it would certainly be impossible to believe that the Church could have adopted in the fourth century, and could have pursued for many centuries afterwards, a mistaken policy with regard to the secular power and to religious coercion. But such a view of the Church is surely altogether irreconcilable with her history, and is in no way justified by a true interpretation of the promise contained in St. Matthew xvi. 18, which guarantees, not the infallibility of the Church, but her indestructibility (cp. Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, lect. xv.). The desire to attain inerrancy or infallible guidance is a natural but mistaken one, and when Protestants rejected the authority of

once for all delivered, the teaching of it and the apprehension of it will be in many fragments and in many fashions; it will be conditioned throughout by the limitations of the human instruments. Such, we thought, we could discern to be the ultimate principles of the method of divine revelation; and in harmony with them there were the method and the principles of Christ as seen in the New Testament—the emphasis that He laid upon the necessity of individual sacrifice, the counting of the cost, the taking up of the Cross; the institution of the visible society as the corporate instrument for preserving and handing on divine truth, and the medium through which men were to become "partakers of the divine nature"; the clear warnings that membership in such a body would involve very definite obligations; the necessity that such a body should be separate and distinct from the World, if it was to discharge its task properly and to bear its witness effectively. These we discovered to be the principles acted upon and laid down by our Master, accepted and (in the main) faithfully carried out by the first generation of Christian disciples, recognised and never abandoned by the Church of the first three centuries. I imagine, however, that there may be some who have followed the argument so far, and who do not deny

the Church, they satisfied this desire by trying to find an infallible oracle in the literal interpretation of the Bible. But inerrancy or infallibility would be out of harmony with the general method of God's revelation and His dealings with men.

that the teaching of the New Testament appears to be what I have described, but who shrink, nevertheless, from applying those principles to present conditions. They think, perhaps, that this was only a temporary policy, adapted to a time of storm and stress, when the Church had to fight for its existence against the persecution of a hostile world, and that it became obsolete as soon as the World relaxed its hostility and proffered its friendship and its alliance. I would urge that the *onus probandi* lies with those who uphold such an interpretation. There is nothing in the New Testament itself to suggest that our Lord's teaching about discipleship was of a temporary and provisional character. It is not an isolated thing; it is of a piece with the divine method generally; it is consonant with our experience of the working of motives in the nature of man. And even if we could regard the interpretation of the New Testament precepts as doubtful, the actual results of abandoning the standards of discipleship, and of identifying the Church with a World no longer openly hostile, have not been such as to commend this view to our acceptance. Historically, it is the merging of the Divine Society in the unleavened or imperfectly leavened society around it which has been the source of our troubles. It is not the original teaching about discipleship which is obsolete: it is the gloss of human tradition, by which it was emptied of its meaning; it is the persistent refusal to remember that Christ's kingdom was

not of this world, which we have proved by long experiment to be disastrous.[1] It is not, therefore, the words of Christ that must pass away, but the erroneous human tradition, by which they have been obscured, that must be discarded; it is from the lingering results of this tradition that the Church must extricate herself.

It is, then, to the New Testament and to the general principles of Christ's teaching and action that we must look for a remedy in our present discontents. But this, you will naturally complain, is too vague, and there ought to be some suggestions as to the methods of applying that teaching to existing conditions. If there has been any expectation that I had a ready-made and detailed scheme to put before you, I fear that I must disappoint that expectation. To offer any such detailed plan would be as presumptuous on my

[1] Cp. the fine sermon by Dr. Mozley on "My kingdom is not of this world," *University Sermons*, sermon i. p. 2. "It is the political Christianity of a later age, nay, of an age almost close to our own, that is now antiquated and obsolete, the Christianity which was propped up by civil penalties; but the Christianity of the Gospel is indeed as modern in its spirit as if it had arisen to-day." As to the idea that modern Christians should expect to be the majority, the Bishop of Southwark (Dr. Talbot) writes, "Nothing in Scripture and little in experience would lead us to think that the majority in any class, time, or place will make Christian faith and principle their own" (*The Church's Failure and the Work of Christ*, p. 5). Dean Church in his *Gifts of Civilisation*, sermon ii., appears to defend "the acceptance of society by the Church," maintaining that "the Church was not meant to be always in its first limitations and conditions."

part as it would be premature. The first necessity is that Christian people should realise far more clearly and far more generally the true nature of the present condition of things, and the way in which that condition came about. It has been my endeavour to make some small contribution toward that end. If there be any truth in what I have said, and if the Church ever fully realises the extent of the evil, then there will grow up a conviction of the necessity for change, or at least for a reconsideration of methods; and when there is an ardent and wide-spread sense of the need, the discovery of ways and opportunities must assuredly follow. At present, I fear, the ideas which I have put before you would be dismissed as visionary and unpractical by a very large proportion even of earnest Churchmen.

Yet perhaps I may without undue presumption suggest some general lines of policy and action, which are really the corollaries of the considerations that I have already urged.

I. In the first place, we must work in the direction of reunion. The present state of things, in which diversity of religious belief is reflected in the competitive rivalry of various Christian bodies within the same area, is a scandal and a source of weakness. It impairs the Church's power of witness; it is a plain transgression of a primary Christian principle. The utmost that can be said for it is that perhaps it is preferable to the absolute stagnation which is sometimes found where there is no diversity. But if the Church is to confront the World to any good

purpose there must be union in her ranks. How is that union to be secured? Not by any temporal means of enforcing uniformity. From that course we are for ever precluded. It can only be by spiritual means, by moral suasion, by appealing to New Testament principles, by the argument from history, by inducing men to realise the present evils of disunion. The true nature and authority of the Church must be put before them, not as a hard, external, mechanical theory, but as a necessary means for carrying on Christ's work, as part of the outward organisation and expression of the Body of Christ. And while we insist on the ideal of unity we must not exaggerate uniformity. We do not need a dead or rigid uniformity in every detail. There is a truer ideal than that—as one whose name is honoured in this place has taught us—the ideal of "Unity in Diversity."[1] "The minds of men are diverse"; there were from the first "diversities of gifts" and "differences of administrations"; there are variations of individual and national temperament, of which Christianity, for all its cosmopolitanism, does well to take account, so long as the essential unity is maintained. It is not necessary for true unity that we should have everywhere precisely the same forms of external worship, or the same system of discipline; and even in the sphere of doctrine unity

[1] Dr. Bigg, *Unity in Diversity* (1899). I should like to add my testimony to that of others better qualified to judge than myself, who have acknowledged the exceptional insight and freshness of Dr. Bigg's sermons and lectures.

does not mean identity, except in fundamentals. We are gradually learning that when we found new churches among Oriental peoples, while we rightly carry to them our Creeds, we are ill-advised to export our canons, our rubrics, our XXXIX. Articles of Religion, and our Acts of Uniformity. The lesson is one which we may well apply nearer home.[1]

And are there not abundant signs that the moral appeal for unity is not being made in vain? Everywhere men are becoming more and more dissatisfied with our divisions, and are beginning to grope after unity, if haply they may find it. I need only mention one or two recent indications of this tendency. Desire for unity was an unmistakable feature of the Pan-Anglican Congress last year, when discussions

[1] A striking illustration might be drawn from the history of the foundation of the Church of Japan (Nippon Sei Kōkwai), of which an interesting account is given in the *Life and Letters of Bishop Edward Bickersteth*, ch. ix. Bishop Bickersteth wisely defended the decision not to append the XXXIX. Articles to the Service Book (pp. 279-281). Thus he wrote with regard to Art. IX.: "Is not the article on Original Sin, read, as it must be in Japan, altogether apart from the controversy which gave it special point and meaning in England three centuries ago, very liable to misinterpretation by most Eastern Christians?"

The 19th resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1897 runs as follows:—"That it is important that, so far as possible, the Church should be adapted to local circumstances, and the people brought to feel in all ways that no burdens in the way of foreign customs are laid upon them, and nothing is required of them but what is of the essence of the Faith, and belongs to the due order of the Catholic Church."

on the subject were marked by significant speeches from men who belong to a school of thought which is generally supposed to hold aloof from such a movement.[1] The same note was struck by the Dean of Westminster's memorable sermon before the bishops of the Lambeth Conference, and the resolutions of that Conference seem to mark a real, if limited, advance.[2] In Australia negotiations have for some time past been going on between representatives of the Anglican Communion and those

[1] *Pan-Anglican Congress Report*, 1908, vol. vii. Every one who was present at the discussions in Section F ("The Anglican Communion") must remember the pervading spirit of deep dissatisfaction with our present divisions and real longing after unity. See pp. 112-132 for the debate on "The Possibilities of Reunion," and especially the speeches of the Rev. T. A. Lacey and the Rev. H. Erskine Hill. The former suggested that if a Congregationalist body desired reunion, it should be welcomed, and allowed "the exercise of all internal discipline, even the most spiritual, subject only to the very slightest measure of episcopal control," its ministers submitting to conditional reordination. He added: "If the only obstacle to a complete union of Christians was a doubt entertained in some part of the Church about my ordination, I should count it sinful pride to refuse to set that doubt at rest by submitting, under decent conditions, to reordination. As Duchesne once said to me, 'It is no more than St. Chad endured for a like cause' (pp. 124-125). The Rev. W. H. Frere, Superior of the Community of the Resurrection, also spoke very sympathetically with regard to our relations to non-episcopal bodies and our recognition of a "ministry of the Spirit" among Nonconformists (p. 84).

[2] Armitage Robinson, *The Vision of Unity*, sermon i. See Resolutions 75-78 (*Report*, p. 65), and the corresponding report of the Committee on Reunion and Intercommunion, section vii. pp. 183-191.

of separated Christian bodies.[1] In Scotland during the last month a noticeable step has been taken towards the reunion of the Establishment and United Free Church.[2] In England union has recently been effected between some of the separated Methodist bodies.[3] There is a nearer approach to mutual understanding, a greater readiness to co-operate in moral and social work; and the Student Christian Movement—a movement, it seems to me, of the greatest interest and value—has shown that it is possible for Christians who belong to very different bodies to combine for study and prayer on an interdenominational basis, without compromise of principle and without any sense of unreality.[4]

[1] In Australia the suggestion for considering terms of reunion emanated from the Presbyterians. The matter was taken up by the Anglican General Synod of Australia and representatives were appointed to negotiate; but up to the present time, I believe, no generally acceptable proposal has been formulated with regard to the question of episcopal ordination.

[2] In the month before this lecture was delivered the Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland had for the first time accepted the principle of an unrestricted Conference with the United Free Church (*i.e.* a Conference at which the whole question of Establishment should be regarded as an open one), and had appointed a Committee of 100 ministers and laymen to meet a similar body from the United Free Church.

[3] In 1907 the first Conference of the "United Methodist Church" was held in London; the new body includes the denominations known until then as (1) The Methodist New Connexion, (2) Bible Christians, (3) The United Methodist Free Church.

[4] The Student Christian Movement has become world-wide, and the number of students and professors who are members of

As regards our relations with the Eastern Church or the Roman Communion the outlook is, no doubt, less cheering. Between the former and our own Communion there has certainly been an increased friendliness in recent years, and slowly but surely there is an approach to a clearer understanding of each other's position.[1] Even with regard to our relations with Rome, it may, I think, be said with truth that the number of those on either side who deprecate division and realise its evils tends to grow larger every year.[2] Speaking generally, the

the Federation is now 138,000, while the number of Student Christian Unions is 2060. The number of members is remarkable, considering the fact that a student, when he leaves college, ceases to be a member of the Federation, unless he has become a Student Volunteer. The movement has done much to foster a keen missionary spirit, and appears, so far, to have succeeded in avoiding the danger of sinking into a vague undenominationalism.

[1] *Report of Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion*, 1908, p. 171: "As regards our relation with the Churches of the Orthodox East, your Committee record with thankfulness that there has been a steady growth of friendly intercourse between the two Communions during the period which has passed since the last Lambeth Conference." By Resolution 6, the Conference asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a permanent Committee to take cognisance of all that concerns the relations of the Anglican Communion with the Orthodox Eastern Communion.

[2] The Committee of the last Lambeth Conference recognised the uselessness of making any proposal for intercommunion with the Church of Rome, but took note of certain hopeful tendencies in the literature current in the Roman Church and in the writings of some Roman Catholic theologians (*Report*, p. 176). Among liberal Catholics in France there has been a marked growth of interest in the Church of England (A. L. Lilley, *Modernism*, p. 232 f.)

difficulties in the way of intercommunion or reunion are far less connected with doctrine than with government. In the sphere of government and organisation there are formidable difficulties, and it is useless to pretend that they do not exist. Indeed, the whole path towards reunion is beset with difficulty, and a wrong turning or a premature step might be the cause of grave mischief. It may be doubted, for instance (as has been shrewdly pointed out), whether it would be much real gain to have a united Protestantism facing a united Catholicism; or a united Episcopal Christianity confronted by a united non-Episcopal;[1] and to many observers it seems as if the position which the Anglican Communion holds between the Roman and Eastern Churches on one side and the Protestant Communions on the other, might providentially fit her for the task of mediating between extremes which otherwise would be separated by a gulf so wide as to make mutual understanding impossible.[2] However this may be, the process must necessarily be a slow one. It will need decades, perhaps

[1] *Pan-Anglican Congress Report*, vol. vii. p. 114, in a speech by the Rev. Lord William Gascoyne-Cecil.

[2] *Id. ibid.*, and cp. Newman Smyth, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, p. 162. "The Episcopal Church, by virtue of its tradition and position, has, as no other, I am venturing to say, the opportunity and the call to become the mediating Church among all the Churches." The context seems to make it clear that Dr. Newman Smyth is speaking of the Church of England and the Anglican Communion, for he proceeds to refer to "the Lambeth overture."

generations, to spread and to intensify the conditions without which formal and complete reunion would be vain, and even intercommunion would be difficult. The perfect work of patience will not be seen by the eyes of the youngest who is present here to-day; but the process has begun and will continue, and in proportion as it spreads and operates, it will increase the effectiveness with which the Church bears her perpetual witness before the world.

II. Reunion, then, must be one of the foremost objects at which we must aim. But we saw that there was an evil even more serious than our disunion—the evil of nominal Christianity, of membership without obligation. If reunited Christianity is to be effective, it must mean something; it must not be a vague and watery sentiment, but a coherent and binding fellowship. The restoration of such an ideal, again, must be a slow and gradual work. The conviction that religion must cost something, the recognition that a true discipline is not a narrow and intolerant mediaeval development but a primitive condition—that it is, in fact, the necessary correlative of discipleship,—this belief has to be created afresh in men's minds; men must learn anew that membership in the Christian body is a thing which you are free to take or to leave, but that, if you take it, it imposes on you obligations both to the Head and to the fellow-members, that it demands both individual and corporate loyalty. If that belief ever again becomes wide-spread—and once it was universal—then in some form or another a wholesome

discipline will be restored. Meanwhile, the Church should recognise more and more that she is in reality a missionary Church, not only in heathen lands and among races which we are pleased to call "inferior," but in every country; and that there is much which she might learn from the methods of the Mission Field. There has been (thank God) a great revival of the missionary spirit in our time. Compared with any ideal standard, of course, we still lag far behind; many among us are lukewarm, and there are many adversaries. Yet compared with a century ago, or even with fifty or thirty years ago, there is an unmistakable revival; and it is one of the most cheering signs of the times, for there is no surer proof of deadness and decay than the cessation of missionary effort. Much of the best work of the Church is being done in the foreign Mission Field, and much of her highest enthusiasm is being devoted to that field. There is a growing consciousness that such work belongs to the Church as a whole, and not merely to this or that society;[1] men of very different opinions are being drawn together by enthusiasm for a common object; there is a keener study of missionary methods, and a general return to sounder principles. No true missionary would now desire to revert to the old methods of coercion, even were it

[1] This feeling has found expression in the creation of the Central Board of Missions, and in the formation of a Diocesan Board of Missions in almost every diocese in England, with the entire goodwill of the keenest supporters of the great missionary societies.

possible to revive Charlemagne's alternative of baptism or the sword. There has been a general abandonment of the wholesale methods of promiscuous preaching and indiscriminate baptism, which lasted on beyond the Middle Ages and marked (*e.g.*) the Jesuit missions in India and Japan or the (so-called) "evangelisation" of the South American Continent, and which rendered almost futile the devoted labours of so noble-hearted a missionary as François Xavier.[1] It is now widely recognised that, if a mission is to produce permanent results, it must pursue a policy of concentration rather than one of diffusion.[2] There will always be some diffused work going on round the centre, but the centre itself is the important thing. Infinite pains must be expended on winning those who, when they are really converted, will strengthen their brethren. Native Churches must be slowly built up out of carefully selected materials. There must be a long process of sifting by the catechumenate, by

[1] Cp. lecture iv. Appendix, Note B, p. 380. Bishop Mylne, in his *Missions to Hindus*, ch. iv., has shown in a convincing manner the results of Xavier's rapid and diffusive methods in India, and has compared them with the results of later and more concentrated missionary work, *e.g.* that of Carey and Caldwell.

[2] *Id. ibid.*, pp. 129-130: "A few really Christianised people, with the means of future extension—this he (Carey) seems to have set before him as his object. He left no great body of converts, but he laid a solid foundation to be built on by those who should succeed him. . . . I should hardly be saying too much, if I lay down that subsequent missions have proved to be successful or the opposite in a proportion fairly exact to their adoption of Carey's methods."

continuous instruction, by the wise disciplining of the new converts, who are under constant temptation to relapse under the pressure of old social or religious customs or inherited tendencies. The wise missionary is contented with results so slow that they often provoke the derision of the nominal Christians who scoff at missions: the annual reports of our best missions sometimes have scarcely one definite conversion to record, sometimes only a handful; the accession of large numbers at one time, as in Uganda or in parts of Southern India, is the exception, and needs to be carefully watched.[1] Such is the method now prevalent in the foreign mission field. I submit that, different though our conditions are, there is much that we may learn from it as to the work of the Church at home. The theory of national Christianity and of a Christian England stands in the way of our recognising this; but the

[1] It is by no means intended to imply that due care is not being exercised in both these fields of work, but only that the readiness of the people to accept Christianity is a source of difficulty. Thus the Bishop of Madras writes with regard to the mass movement in the Telegu country: "The difficulty is not to make converts, but to teach the large masses of catechumens, and to provide for the pastoral care of the baptized Christians. . . . What is now needed is that definite provision should be made for about 15,000 or 20,000 new catechumens each year" (*Second Annual Review of Foreign Missions*, 1909, issued by the Central Board of Missions, p. 31). For the wonderful work of the C.M.S. Mission in Uganda, where there are about 60,000 baptised converts, cp. *ibid.*, p. 61. The standard of discipline and self-sacrifice among these African and Indian converts is one which the Church at home might well envy.

theory is breaking down before the facts. Our parochial system is largely failing where the population is massed in great cities. We hear more and more of Home Missions, and much of the best work that the Church of England is now doing, is being done on missionary lines. "Our cities and great towns," says the Archbishop of York, "are at least an open mission field: the land is yet to be possessed . . . we are dealing with a people not lost to the Church, but waiting to be won. They have not fallen from the Church, for they were never within it."[1] Under such conditions it should be recognised that missionary work on lines of concentration affords the best hope. That does not preclude the use of other means as well: there is plenty of room for house-to-house visiting or for street-preaching; but the most hopeful method is to make quality, not quantity, the first object—to secure a few good Christians, who will in their turn be real missionaries, rather than many bad ones, to whom membership has no real meaning, and whose lives will do nothing to commend their creed.[2] And what is true of work among the masses is, I think, true in a measure of Church work everywhere. In smaller parishes, or among the comfortable or wealthy classes, the fact is not so glaring that it is only a minority to whom membership in the Church means anything; but it is a fact all the same, and the

[1] Lang, *The Opportunity of the Church of England*, p. 39.

[2] Cp. Bp. Gore, *Epistle to Ephesians*, p. 190, already quoted on p. 273.

method of concentration is the true and primary method. There is room for diffusion also, but the essential thing is to win and to keep those who are capable of making an earnest response, the true disciples; for every true disciple is at heart a missionary. There are few more encouraging features in the Church work of to-day than the spread of the Church of England Men's Society; and its work seems to me to depend on the recognition of this principle of concentration.[1] It is not that we should wish to be exclusive—God forbid! the Church must always have an invitation and a welcome for all who will come, and especially for the poor and the ignorant, the outcast and the downhearted. Not for one moment must we accept the principle of the Pharisee, "This multitude which knoweth not the law are accursed."[2] We must always desire to win as many recruits as possible; only we want to know that they have counted the cost before they join. We do not want to win them to a nominal religion which will cost them nothing:

[1] Cp. the account of the objects of this Society ("C.E.M.S."), given by its present president, the Archbishop of York, *Opportunity of the Church of England*, p. 188. "The Rule of Life, binding alike on members and associates, is simple but fundamental—to pray to God every day, and to do something to help forward the work of the Church." The Society is greatly needed; but is it not the most emphatic condemnation of our present condition of membership in the Church without obligation that it should require a special society to uphold these two most elementary requirements of prayer and service?

[2] St. John vii. 49.

we may be sure that if its cost is nothing, its value will be nothing also. We want every one to be willing to pay the price, but we also want no one to be deceived into thinking that the price can be withheld; and we must therefore avoid any methods which employ bribes or cajolery of any sort, or which rely on making religion so cheap that the idea of sacrifice reaches vanishing-point. We have far too much of that kind of religion already. The idea that nobody can be expected to walk half a mile to a church; the demand for Pleasant Sunday Afternoons, or for a short and hurried service at an hour which will leave Sunday free for golf or motoring; the effect on our congregations of a shower of rain which would not deter any one from keeping a social engagement; the persistent refusal to apply Christian principles to business or to private life,—all these are indications of the spirit which is always hoping to deceive God by offering Him that which costs nothing. If we cannot banish that spirit, at least we need not cater for it. We must definitely put quality before quantity, and lay perpetual emphasis on the truth that religion means sacrifice, if it means anything at all. We must remind men that freedom to join or to leave a society does not mean freedom to neglect obligations while you belong to it. We may well recall that vital distinction which St. Paul drew between "them that are without" and "them that are within."[1] We have nothing to do with judging those that are without; those who elect to stand

[1] 1 Cor. v. 12-13. Cp. lecture i. p. 28.

outside the Christian society must be judged by God alone; but those who claim membership in the Christian society, by the very fact of that claim, subject themselves to judgment by Christian standards. It is, I believe, only by setting our faces in this direction that we shall ever feel our way back towards coherence and solidarity, discipleship and enthusiasm, to the consciousness of universal responsibility and the duty and joy of universal service. Every Christian ought to be a missionary. If he values the privileges that he has won, he will not be satisfied without bringing others to share in them. And in the Christian warfare, as in any other campaign, a drilled and disciplined and eager army of 10,000 men would be worth more than a host like that of Xerxes, with its hordes of untrained troops and its unwieldy train of non-combatants and camp-followers.

III. It may be asked, What would be the effect of such a policy as I have described upon the relations between religion and the State? Would not the effect be to make it more difficult to retain anything in the nature of "Establishment"? I do not think it can be denied that it would. The natural tendency of an Established Church is to be, as far as possible, co-extensive with the nation; it asks no awkward questions, and makes no inconvenient demands; it accepts as a member any citizen who does not specifically refuse to be included. I do not say that this is inevitably the case: theoretically, the State might think fit to "establish" an exclusive religious body

of a quite different type ; but, practically, the natural tendency is what I have described. A Church, therefore, which sets itself to make membership more of a reality must, if it is an Established Church, count the cost, and be prepared for an alteration in its relations with the State. I want to speak on this matter with as little reference as possible to current political questions, and, as far as possible, to consider only general principles. Whenever any particular proposals are under discussion, the question is always complicated by side issues or extraneous considerations. Disestablishment is bound up with disendowment ; the particular terms which are offered may seem hard, or the time inopportune, or the motives behind the scheme vindictive, or the area chosen for the change unjustifiable—and so forth. But with regard to the general question of the relations between Church and State, we have already seen that the Establishment which exists at present in England is of an attenuated sort, the *simulacrum* of a former full-blooded alliance of Church and State on the basis of an enforced conformity and a religious monopoly. We saw that in England piecemeal disestablishment had been proceeding for a long time; we observed that it had been found impossible to transplant Establishment across the Atlantic or to the Southern Hemisphere. Within the remembrance of many in this congregation today the Church was disestablished in Ireland ; only three years ago we witnessed the rapid accomplishment of the separation of Church and State in

France.[1] The question does not seem to be a burning one at present in those countries where Establishment remains; but it is quite possible that we may see separation take place elsewhere, and it is quite certain, I imagine, that we shall never again see the creation of an Established Church *de novo.* The area of Establishment is destined to contract, not to expand, because the ideas and conditions which gave birth to the principle have passed, or are passing, away. We can no longer assume that every man is a Christian and a Churchman, still less can we force any man to become either; and although we hope that the divisions between Christians will be reduced by reunion, the number of those who either reject Christianity altogether or are wholly indifferent to its claims will (so far as we can predict) be permanently fatal to the hope of any uniform national religion. Establishment, then, is no

[1] The repeal of the Concordat had long been an article in the Radical programme, but successive Governments had fought shy of the question, until M. Combes took it up. The change, when once proposed, met with a feeble resistance in the Chamber, and was carried through with remarkable rapidity. The General Elections which have since taken place in France are a proof that the new policy was acceptable to the great majority of voters. For an account of the events which led to the separation, cp. P. Sabatier, *Disestablishment in France* (1906). The repeal of the Concordat has put an end to the strange condition of things under which the President of the Republic had to preside at ecclesiastical functions such as the investiture of French cardinals, although he dared not pronounce the name of God in any public utterance owing to the prevailing tyranny of free thought (Bodley, *France* book i. ch. ii.).

longer logical; but many people pride themselves upon their scorn for logic in the region of practical affairs. I do not share that scorn, for logic, I observe, generally takes its revenge in the long run; but, things being as they are, it will be on grounds of expediency that the matter will be decided. Let us try to look at such considerations dispassionately. There are many considerations which weigh heavily with different types of mind in favour of continuing the connection between Church and State. Reverent minds value the national recognition of religion, and shrink from the breach as an act of national apostasy. Practical people fear the crippling of the work of the Church by the disendowment which in some degree would certainly be associated with disestablishment. Timid people are afraid that the Church of England would split into fragments without the cohesive influence of the State connection. Erastians value the control of the State as a restraint of spiritual independence and of the extravagances of clericalism. Statesmen appreciate the difficulty of carrying through a measure of vast complexity; while many men who are indifferent to the merits of the question dislike the motives of jealousy from which such schemes often derive considerable support.[1]

[1] In a previous note (lecture vii. p. 290) reference has been made to living writers who have laid stress on the value of Establishment. Mention ought also to be made of Dr. Fremantle's Bampton Lectures (1883) *The World as the Subject of Redemption*, in which the identification of Church and Nation is defended with force and learning in a long historical argument. His whole point of view is so completely different from that which is taken

All these considerations favour a continuance of the present condition of things, and some of them are worthy of much respect. In the opposite scale must be placed (apart from the arguments from logic and history) the practical disadvantages of Parliamentary control, the hindrances and delays to needed reforms, the restrictions on self-government, the danger of conflict between the law of the State and the law of the Church; and, above all, the influence of Establishment in obscuring the true nature of the Church's claim and the obligations of membership. Different minds will, no doubt, assign different values in the equation, and will arrive at different results. Without either concealing or obtruding my own view that logic and expediency point in the same direction, I would fully acknowledge that it would be a great mistake to suppose that the separation of Church and State would prove to be an instantaneous cure for all our troubles. To submit to it reluctantly, or even to accept it willingly, would be useless, if we cling to ideals of social privilege,

in the present lectures that it is unnecessary to controvert the arguments in detail. I may quote as typical a sentence on p. 281 (2nd ed.): "We ought therefore to regard the nation as the Church, its rulers as ministers of Christ, its whole body as a Christian brotherhood, its public assemblies as among the highest modes of Christian fellowship, its dealing with material interests as sacraments, its progressive development, especially in raising the weak, as the fullest service rendered on earth to God, the nearest thing as yet within our reach to the kingdom of heaven." This, in my view, is a repetition of the old mediaeval fallacy in a new form, by the absorption of the spiritual into the secular.

or wholesale conformity, or promiscuous and meaningless membership. If one may apply the Pauline principle, neither Establishment avails anything nor Disestablishment, but a new spirit. Wrongly used, Disestablishment might be something like calamity; rightly used, even those who do not welcome the change need not fear it. It might be in many ways a true "liberation"—an increase of liberty, responsibility, creative energy; it ought to help towards restoring a less blurred line between the Church and the World, and to evoke a deeper and wider response of self-sacrifice. And it seems as if the alternative to it might be an attempt to create an undenominational State-religion, beginning in the schools, and spreading to the churches. Such an attempt would be mischievous, but could hardly be permanent. The State can never really teach religion: it has neither the authority nor the aptitude, even when people are united in belief, still less when they are divided; and if it ever attempts the office, it will discharge it awkwardly and ineffectively. The path towards religious unity does not lie that way. Reunion must be spiritual and voluntary, not secular and extraneous and Procrustean.[1]

[1] Voluntary agreement between different religious bodies to share common lessons in particular subjects might in some cases be quite possible and unobjectionable (cp. Moberly, *Problems and Principles*, p. 225), but this is wholly different from coercive undenominationalism. If the State wishes to have religious citizens —and a wise State will certainly wish it—the true policy is for the State to help the different religious bodies impartially by full facilities, and, if necessary, by financial aid, to give effective

Let me, before I conclude, deal briefly with a few objections which (I can foresee) will be advanced against this view of the relations between the Church and the World. The first objection was partially anticipated in the last lecture—that the view is a pessimistic one. The primary question, I repeat, is whether it is true. But, apart from that, I am not conscious of any pessimism. On the contrary, I am confident of the unexhausted power of the Christian Church to do its work in the World. If the World were suffering from too much Christianity we might well be pessimistic; but, in fact, the World is suffering from having too little Christianity and not from having too much. If we looked back on nineteen centuries of history and found that the Church had always worked on the wisest and truest methods, and yet had failed so largely, then, indeed, we might have reason to be depressed; but what we have found is that the Church was in too great a hurry to assimilate the World, and therefore adopted mistaken methods. By reverting to the earlier and more fruitful methods we may once again witness more encouraging results.

Another objection is that the view which I have maintained is narrow, exclusive, Pharisaic, Puritan. On this also I have said something already. I will ask you to remember the distinctions which I drew

religious training, each according to its own principles. Religious instruction is of little value if it does not succeed in attaching the child to some religious body and system of worship.

between *imperfect* Christianity and *nominal* Christianity, and between those within and those without.[1] The Church, if she be true to her Master, will never desire to exclude for the sake of excluding. But every society must be in some sense exclusive, just as every affirmation must deny its contradictory, and every choice must involve renunciation. A society exists for some specific object, and must therefore exclude those who do not sympathise with the object; otherwise it is meaningless and self-stultified. And so the Church, if she is to regain her effectiveness and coherence, must insist that her members shall be sufficiently in agreement to be able to walk together, and sufficiently convinced of the value of their common aim to be willing to make some sacrifice for its attainment. Beyond that she ought not to go; but whereas she has sometimes erred by exaggerating the necessary standard of agreement in intellectual belief, she has constantly crippled her powers by neglecting the latter requirement, which is more difficult to test and to enforce. Her desire must always be, not to exclude, but to include. She must be no respecter of persons, she must be democratic and cosmopolitan, she must take no account of birth, or wealth, or education, or of any qualifications but those which her Master laid down for those who wished to become His disciples.

Others, again, may apprehend that my argument has been advanced in the interests of clericalism or sacerdotalism. That, again, is not the case. My

[1] See pp. 28, 282, 325.

intention, indeed, is precisely the reverse. The principle that membership ought to be a reality might be held and applied just as strongly in a Presbyterian Church as in an Episcopal, in a system of organisation where the laity are fully represented just as much as in one where all the power is in the hands of the clergy. I desire with all my heart to see the laity taking a far larger share in the work of the Church than they do at present in England or in any other countries. I want them to become a true λαός, or people of God, not to be content to leave the work of the Church to the clergy, and then to criticise them in newspapers or to control them through Parliament. We want a Church reform which will give the laity their proper place in the councils of the Church.[1] They are already taking a more adequate share in them in the freer atmosphere of the Church in the Colonies. But the mischief is that we have a quite inadequate number of laymen who are interested, and a layman who is keenly interested in Church work is generally sneered at as an "ecclesi-

[1] Real advance in this direction has been made during recent years, largely through the work of the Church Reform League and the gradual permeation of ideas such as those that were put forward some twelve years ago by various writers in *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*, edited by Dr. Gore. But the dead weight of inherited and traditional apathy on the part of laymen is a serious obstacle, and usually it is difficult to get laymen to attend ruridecanal or diocesan conferences, while the system of indirect election to the Houses of Laymen tends to stifle interest. Meanwhile the defenders of Parliamentary control sneer at the Houses of Laymen as "semi-clerical" (Henson, *The National Church*, Introduction by Dr. Llewelyn Davies, p. xi.).

astically minded layman," who is supposed to be more clerical than the clergy. As a matter of fact, a secularised and apathetic laity means a professionalised and isolated clergy.[1] The popular identification of the Church with the clergy—which may be illustrated by that terrible phrase, "He is going into the Church," as applied to some one about to be ordained—is the mark of an apathetic laity; it is not usually found in the mouths of persons of sacerdotal tendencies. It is used by those for whom the idea of lay churchmanship has lost its meaning; and I believe that similar phrases were first used in the fourth century, when wholesale conformity first brought about that condition of affairs.[2] I would not for one moment deny that a narrow clericalism or an arrogant sacerdotalism has sometimes robbed the laity of their interest in the work of the Church; but I do entirely deny that the revival of the obligations of Church membership need tend to depress the lay element. It would, no doubt, diminish the number of nominal laymen, but it would increase the interest and activity and influence of those who cared, and that would be an untold gain.

The objection which still remains is perhaps the

[1] I think that I owe this sentence, in substance if not in exact form, to an article by the Rev. A. H. Simpson in *The Lay Reader* in 1909.

[2] Such expressions may be traced, I believe, as early as the *Codex Theodosianus*, if not in the extant writings of Constantine; but I have omitted to note any exact references, and must, therefore, not lay stress on this point.

most formidable of all. It will be said that my argument sets up a dualism between the Church and the World, between the Church in each country and the State or nation; that it denies to the State all part and lot in religious matters; and that in this way it secularises the State instead of sanctifying it, while it divides the allegiance of the Christian citizen between two rival and unrelated authorities.[1] The argument is plausible, but not convincing when examined more closely. To distinguish between the things of Caesar and the things of God is not to despise Caesar or to refuse him due loyalty. Even when the State was most hostile, and its all-powerful rulers were amongst the most worthless of mankind, the Early Church did not refuse obedience and loyalty in all things lawful. The Christian may be a devoted citizen and a true patriot, and he will be so all the more when the laws of the State reflect the Christian morality. The State is "from God," and has a sanctity of its own, but it need not therefore be confounded with the Church. It is when their functions are confused that conflicts arise; if their respective areas are delimited, there need not be many occasions of conflict. "A free Church in a free State" does not mean that the State need be atheistic or merely secular in its ideals, or that

[1] Cp. Bishop Creighton, *The Church and the Nation*, p. 34: "I can think of nothing so tending to debase the ideal of the State as talk about 'freeing the Church from the bondage of the State'"; and J. H. B. Masterman, *The Rights and Responsibilities of National Churches* (Hulsean Lectures), p. 80 f.

Churchmen should hold aloof from civic duties.[1] Both Church and State are from God, but they differ in their province, their authority, their functions, and their method. The State is concerned with things seen and temporal; the Church with things unseen and eternal. The State has authority over every inhabitant of a given country; membership in the Church is dependent on free choice. The State rightly employs coercion and uses the motive of fear; the Church must appeal to the love which (as to-day's Epistle reminds us) casts out fear.[2] There is much, no doubt, that is noble and attractive in the desire to blend or identify the two great authorities to which human loyalty is due; but history shows us the failure both of theocracies, in which the State

[1] "*Libera Chiesa in libero Stato*" was the celebrated formula of Cavour, who would have given the Roman Church in Italy a real freedom, abandoning bureaucratic control and the policy of pin-pricks in exchange for the surrender of the claim to the temporal power. At one time, apparently, he was not far from success. But the temporal claims have never been abandoned, and the present Law of Guarantees in Italy has not always been successful, but has sometimes been stretched by the Government in its own interest. Cp. King and Okey, *Italy of To-day* (1901), chs. ii. and xiii. In a book entitled *La Libera Chiesa in libero Stato*, by Dr. B. de Rinaldis (Turin, 1865), Cavour's principle is developed historically and philosophically, but the author denies to the Church the position of a *societas perfecta*, and argues that it can only be independent *in foro interno*, not *in foro externo*. For a more recent view cp. *La Chiesa e i tempi nuovi* (1906), by Mgr. Bonomelli, Bishop of Cremona, whose courageous acceptance of independence in place of privilege was, I believe, displeasing to the Vatican.

[2] 1 St. John iv. 18.

has been made a function of the Church, and of Erastian enterprises by which the Church has been subjected to the State. Let each power have its proper sphere and employ its proper methods. We do not disparage the body by saying that it is not the soul, but only when we insist that it is inherently evil. Even so we do not disparage the State by saying that it is distinct from the Church, and must not attempt the work which is proper to the Church. It is by the recognition of their distinctness that the area of possible conflict can best be restricted. It may not be possible to ensure that *no* conflict shall ever arise; and in such cases the State will always have the last word, because she has material force at her disposal. Yet she will be wise to recognise the power of spiritual principles, and to remember that though the Church is an anvil, it is, as a Huguenot leader reminded the King of France, "an anvil which has broken many hammers."[1] And the Church, if in any case she feels bound to refuse obedience in duty to a higher allegiance, must be prepared to suffer for doing so; after all, adversity, not prosperity, is the birthright promised by her Lord. There is a sense, surely, in which Luther's saying is profoundly true—"*Leiden, Leiden, Kreuz, Kreuz, ist der Christen Recht—das und kein anderes.*"[2]

---

[1] Mr. Taylor Innes (*Church and State*, p. 22) attributes this saying to the Huguenot Rivet, who used the words to Francis I.

[2] *Luther's Politische Schriften* (Mundt), ii. 93, quoted by Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius*, pp. 65, 241.

Must the Church of God, then, for ever confine herself to the narrower hope? Must she for ever abandon the task of making disciples of all the nations? or, at least, interpret the command in the sense of making *some* disciples in *every* nation? I do not think that it is for us to make long forecasts, or to indulge in anxious speculations as to ultimate events. It is remarkable how often and how significantly our Lord rebuked the habit of curious speculation. "Lord," asked the apostles, "dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" "It is not for you to know times or seasons . . . but ye shall receive power." "Lord," said one, "are there few that be saved?" "Strive to enter in by the narrow door," is the sternly practical answer. "When shall the kingdom of God come?" inquired the Pharisees. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation," is the reply.[1] So it must be with us to-day. The distant future lies in designed obscurity. There are some passages of Scripture which seem to encourage, and others which seem to restrict, the wider hope. How far the kingdom of this world will literally become the kingdom of our God and of His Christ we cannot predict; but we can see that it has not yet become so, and is not likely to become so within any period of time with which we are immediately concerned. We can only, at each moment, take the step next before us, and see that it is taken rightly and with sure footing. It is our business to be faithful to principles, and to be careless about

[1] Acts i. 6, 7, 8; St. Luke xiii. 23, 24; xvii. 20, 21.

results; it is the putting of results before principles which has so constantly proved disastrous. Our *ideal* must be to make the Church co-extensive with the World, but we are forbidden to try to attain that ideal by any unworthy compromise. We must level up the World and not level down the Church. We must never disguise the fact that Christ makes his claim upon the whole life of every disciple, and that he who cannot receive the kingdom of God "as a little child" must not hope to enter therein. The Church must be *in* the World, but must not be *of* the World; *in* the World, and yet preserved, if it may be, from the evil. She must bear her perpetual witness, must be the salt, the light, and the leaven. If the Church is ever to overcome the World, the victory must be won by the faith of her children—faith in the Divine Master and the historic Incarnation; faith in the Divine Society, which is the Body of Christ. We must have faith, not as "light half-believers of our casual creeds"; we must believe, and we must live as if we believed, that in very truth "the Dayspring from on high hath visited us; to give light to them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death, and to guide our feet into the way of peace."

Let us endeavour to live out that belief, not like men conformed to the world, but like men transformed, like men who behold and reflect as in a mirror the glory of the Lord. Then will the heaven-sent breath come from the four winds, and breathe upon the bones which seem so dry, and they shall live.

Then, in those most beautiful words of one of the ancient prayers of the Church of Christ, it may come to pass that "the whole world may feel and see that the things which were cast down are being built up, and the things which had grown old are being made new, and that all things are returning to perfection through Him from whom they took their origin."[1]

[1] *Gelasian Sacramentary* (ed. H. A. Wilson, 1894), p. 82 "Deus, incommutabilis virtus, lumen aeternum, respice propitius ad totius ecclesiae tuae mirabile sacramentum, et opus salutis humanae perpetuae dispositionis affectu tranquillus operare, totusque mundus experiatur et videat deiecta erigi, inveterata novari, et per ipsum redire omnia in integrum, a quo sumpsere principia."

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

LECTURE I

NOTE A

See p. 9

The Dates of the New Testament Books

For a clear and reasoned general statement of the position which I believe to be best supported with regard to this question, I may refer to the lecture by Dr. Headlam in *Criticism of the New Testament* (St. Margaret's Lectures, 1902; 2nd edition, 1903). This unpretending volume, which contains lectures by Dr. Sanday, Dr. Kenyon, Dr. Burkitt, Bishop Chase, and Dr Bernard, is representative of the best traditions of English critical scholarship. Dr. Headlam, who rightly lays stress on the knowledge of the New Testament writings shown by the Apostolic Fathers, arrives at the following results as to the chronology:—

Synoptic Gospels. 60-80. St. Mark the earliest, probably soon after 64.

St. John's Gospel. 80-100. Directly or indirectly the work of John the Apostle.

Acts of the Apostles. 60-90. By St. Luke.

Pauline Epistles. First Group. 1 and 2 Thessalonians. 48-51.

Second Group. Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans 50-58.

Third Group. Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Philemon. 57-61.

Fourth Group. 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus. 58-64. (All the

Epistles are regarded as genuine; the arguments against the Pastoral Epistles are allowed to be stronger than those against the rest, but are largely of an *a priori* character, while the external evidence for them is very good.)

Epistle to the Hebrews. 65-90 (probably 65-70). Authorship uncertain; certainly not Pauline.

St. James. Uncertain; but a late date such as 150 improbable, and probably it was written by St. James at the time of the Pauline controversy.

1 *St. Peter.* No proof of its being later than 64; but cannot be proved earlier than 80-90

2 *St. Peter.* } Uncertain; no external testimony before 150,
St. Jude. } but not shown to be later than first century.

Epistles of St. John. 80-100. By the Apostle John.

Apocalypse. 95-96. Probably also by the Apostle; but the authorship of "John the Presbyter" not impossible, although the existence of such a person has not been clearly proved.

The general result is that we may, with probability, regard the New Testament writings, with a few doubtful exceptions, as belonging to the second half of the first century, and as being the genuine works of those writers whose names they bear.

Any one who compares the limits of date given above with the chronological table given by Harnack in his *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (zweiter Teil, *Die Chronologie*, erster Band, Leipzig, 1897, pp. 717 f.) will see that, as regards chronology, there is a considerable measure of agreement, though Harnack accepts a late date for the Pastoral Epistles in their present form, and for St. James, 2 St. Peter, and St. Jude. As regards authorship, Harnack has recently accepted the Lucan authorship of the third Gospel and the Acts, and although he questions the Pastoral Epistles and the Ephesians, and does not ascribe the fourth Gospel to John the Apostle, his position, so far as regards dates, is very much nearer to that of the English school of criticism than to that of the "advanced" or "destructive" school of criticism, as represented by Schmiedel and van Manen abroad, and in England by Dr. Abbott. With regard to this school Dr. Headlam writes, not unjustly (p. 181)—

"The careful investigation and accurate dating of documents of the second century, and especially of the Apostolic Fathers, have made writings like those of Professor Schmiedel and Dr. Abbott as much behind the times as the Greek Testament of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth."

With regard to the *a priori* character of the attempt to assign a late date to the New Testament books, Sir W. Ramsay says (*The Education of Christ*, p. 121-2):—

"Those scholars did not begin to suspect a late origin for those books on account of the indications which they had detected in them. On the contrary, having for other reasons formed the belief that the books must be incorrect and unhistorical, they framed the theory of their late origin, and then set to work to find in them the required indications of lateness.

"The real ultimate cause of their eagerness to discover historical grounds on which to rest their theory was in their preconceived idea that the Divine nature could not have appeared on earth in human form—in other words, that the Divine cannot manifest itself to man in a way to be cognisable by his faculties."

It is contended, then, that the attempt to assign late second century dates to the New Testament writings has, so far, failed. The interpretation of the writings themselves involves, as has been said, other considerations besides those of date and authorship. It is open to a critic to maintain, *e.g.*, that though St. Luke was the author of the third Gospel and of the Acts, he was either consciously falsifying history, or was unconsciously mistaken in his facts and in his inferences. But it may be questioned whether the critics who wish wholly to eliminate the miraculous, or to account for the belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ as a gradual and later development, or to throw doubt upon the traditional accounts of the foundation and growth of the Christian Church, have as yet fully appreciated how much more difficult their task becomes if it must be acknowledged that the New Testament writers were either themselves the companions of Jesus Christ on earth, or were in the closest relations with those who had been His companions.

NOTE B

See p. 10

The Universal Mission of the Church

The question whether Christ contemplated and enjoined a Universal Mission, or whether this universalism was an afterthought on the part of the Apostles, is one of primary importance, and the treatment of it by Dr. Harnack in his *Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (book i. chs. iv. v.) affords a conspicuous instance of the arbitrary methods of criticism which a really great scholar may apply to the writings of the New Testament in obedience to the presuppositions with which he approaches them. It may therefore be worth while to discuss the question briefly. (1) The explicit injunction of a Universal Mission is recorded at the close of each of the Synoptic Gospels and at the beginning of the Acts (St. Matt. xxviii. 19; St. Mark xvi. 15; St. Luke xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8). In the case of the second Gospel the injunction occurs in the "Appendix," which is rightly considered not to have formed part of the original Gospel; but no similar suspicion affects the other three passages. Dr. Harnack boldly expels them with his critical pitchfork. "The Gospels were written in an age when the mission was already in full swing, and they consequently refer it to the direct injunction of Jesus." He finds it useless "to argue with those who see nothing but an inadmissible bias in the refusal to accept traditions about Jesus eating and drinking and instructing his disciples after death." The supposed command is "due to the historical developments of a later age, the words being appropriately put into the mouth of the risen Lord." If Christ be not raised, and there never was a risen Lord, then, plainly, no such command can ever have been uttered. And this is the presupposition of his argument.

(2) Beside the records of an explicit injunction, there are a number of passages in the Gospels which support the view that, although our Lord's own work upon earth was limited to the Jewish people, and His first commission to the Twelve (St. Matt. x. 5) was similarly restricted, the universal extension of the

kingdom hereafter was plainly intended (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 35-36 and 39-41). Even if we put aside the fourth Gospel, which Dr. Harnack admits to be "saturated with statements of a directly universalistic character," we find such passages as St. Matt. viii. 11; xii. 18, 21; xxi. 43; xxii. 9; xxiv. 14; St. Mark xi. 17; xiii. 10; xiv. 9; St. Luke ii. 32; xiii. 29. In face of the fact that these passages are not peculiar to any one Gospel, and that they represent different departments of our Lord's teaching,—apocalyptic, parabolic, incidental,—it is not possible to dismiss them without doing violence to the records. But Dr. Harnack gets rid of them summarily. Thus Mark xiii. 10 "puts into the life of Jesus a historical theologumenon, which is hardly original"; Mark xiv. 9 "excites strong suspicion" . . . "some obscure controversy must underlie the words"; St. Luke "has delicately coloured the introductory history with universalism,"—and so forth. The one positive argument which Dr. Harnack advances against these passages is that they are inconsistent with other passages which he regards as representing Christ's real view of His mission (*e.g.* St. Matt. xv. 24, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel"), and with the restrictions placed upon the mission of the Twelve in St. Matt. x. But he gives no proof that such passages are more "fundamental" than the others, and the supposition of a concentration in the earlier stages, which was to give place to extension afterwards, is surely not an improbable one. Dr. Harnack's theory is in reality coloured by the view that our Lord was merely human, a Jew with a limited Jewish outlook. "All that Jesus Christ promulgated was the overthrow of the temple and the judgment impending upon the nation and its leaders." Whatever may be said for such a view, it is surely plain that it was not the view of the authors of the Gospels.

(3) It is impossible to discuss the question of the Universal Mission without taking into account the language and action of the Apostles after Pentecost, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. From the first we find St. Peter recognising "the full range of future recipients of the Gospel" (Hort, *op. cit.* p. 41; cp. Acts ii. 39), and the circle of preaching gradually widens from

Jerusalem to Judaea, Samaria, Caesarea, Antioch, Asia. Questions arise as to the obligations of Gentile converts with regard to the Jewish law, but the admissibility of Gentiles and the universality of the mission are not long in dispute. It does not seem easy to account for the general acceptance of the Universal Mission upon Dr. Harnack's principles. It would involve a belief that the Apostles, being foolishly persuaded that their Master had risen from the dead, imagined themselves bound to spread His teaching among all nations, although He had never given any such command, or contemplated such a development; and that the Church fulfilled with success this self-imposed and delusive mission. Is such an idea really credible?

The second and third lectures in Dr. Hort's *Judaistic Christianity*, which interpret the New Testament record and do not attempt to rewrite it, afford an instructive contrast in method when compared with Dr. Harnack's chapters on the Universal Mission.

[This note was written before the appearance in the *Expositor* for November, 1909, of an article by Professor J. B. Mayor, entitled "Did Christ contemplate the Admission of the Gentiles into the Kingdom of Heaven?" After a careful examination of the passages in both Old Testament and New Testament which bear upon the question, Professor Mayor concludes that Harnack's objections rest upon dogmatic assumptions not unlike those which he condemns in the Tübingen critics.]

NOTE C

See p. 16

The "Eschatological" Theory of the Gospels

Those who are convinced by the "eschatological" theory of our Lord's life and teaching, which has been fully developed first by Johannes Weiss, and then by Albert Schweitzer, of Strassburg, in his book *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (Tübingen, 1906), and is accepted by M. Loisy and now widely current on the Continent, would maintain that Christ merely proclaimed the immediate

coming of an Apocalyptic Kingdom from heaven, and urged His disciples to prepare for His immediate return. If this were so, naturally He would make little or no provision for a society of disciples pending that return. This school, therefore, minimises His function as a teacher, and reduces His teaching to a scanty "*Interimsethik*," and regards the Christian Church as an afterthought. In spite of the large measure of acceptance which this view has secured, it is difficult to believe that it will prove permanent. It is based upon a too exclusive use of the second Gospel, and even with that it is forced to deal somewhat freely. It appears to ignore the "Parables of the Kingdom" and the interpretation which the Apostles put upon Christ's teaching. It is undoubtedly true that the eschatological side of that teaching presents a problem of extraordinary difficulty, and that this problem has been until recently most strangely ignored in commentaries and in discussions about the life of Christ. The true solution, however, is not likely to be discovered by riding a single idea to death.

Since these lectures were delivered Schweitzer's book has been translated into English under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, with an Introduction by Dr. Burkitt, who has also defended the theory in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*. A sketch of Schweitzer's argument will be found in Dr. Sanday's *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, which may be thought to err in the direction of over-appreciation, and a brilliant exposition of the eschatological theory is contained in the late Father George Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross Roads*. Father Tyrrell was a whole-hearted convert to the view, which he appears to suggest as the only alternative to the "Liberal Protestant" view of Harnack or Bousset as to the mission of Christ. I cannot recognise the cogency of the dilemma, or understand how on the eschatological theory Jesus Christ is anything more than a deluded Jewish visionary, or the Church than a *Chimaera bombinans in vacuo*. For a hostile view of the eschatological school reference may be made to Sir W. Ramsay's recent criticism in the *Expositor*, January 1909, p. 12, where he declares that "no idea in modern scholarship has been so falsely and so wrongly used as this 'eschatology'; no idea has been

more productive of erroneous views and mistaken criticism." Here, perhaps, there is some over-statement. The theory, one-sided as it is, must be met with detailed argument, and there is no problem in the criticism of the Gospels and the life of Christ where sober and thorough investigation is more urgently needed. Cp. also Bishop Gore, *Orders and Unity*, pp. 21 and 50-58.

NOTE D

See p. 22

The Use of κόσμος in the New Testament

The word κόσμος appears to be used altogether 177 times in the New Testament. It is remarkable that no less than 102 of the passages in which it occurs are found in the Johannine writings: 76 in the fourth Gospel, 22 in the first Epistle, 1 in the second Epistle, 3 in the Apocalypse. St. Paul uses the word 46 times, more than half the instances being in the Epistles to the Corinthians. In the Synoptic Gospels it occurs altogether 14 times.

In a large number of passages the word is used without any moral connotation. The classical sense of κόσμος was that of (1) *order*, *constitution* (cp. κοσμεῖν, κόσμιος); (2) *ornament* (cp. 1 St. Peter iii. 3); (3) *the universe*, in which sense it was used by Greek philosophers. In the New Testament the word is frequent in the sense of *universe*, in such expressions as πρὸ (ἀπὸ) καταβολῆς κόσμου, and also in the sense of "the earth," *orbis terrarum*, *e.g.* St. Matt. iv. 8 τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου. From this it comes to be applied, without moral signification, to the inhabitants of the earth generally, the human race, *e.g.* St. Mark xiv. 9. It is not always easy to separate the passages in which the word occurs in a neutral sense from those in which it implies the sense of *alienation from God*; but in a large number of passages in the Johannine writings (probably 27 in St. John xiv.-xviii., and 16 in 1 St. John) it bears a definite moral signification, and this sense is also found in St. Paul (especially in 1 Corinthians), Hebrews, St. James, and 2 St. Peter, but does not occur in the remaining

books of the New Testament. Sometimes the word is applied collectively to the "mass of men alienated from God" (*e.g.* St. John xv. 18 εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ), sometimes to worldly affairs, goods, pleasures, etc., which lead men astray from God (*e.g.* 1 St. John ii. 17 ὁ κόσμος παράγεται καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ). The derivatives κοσμικός and κοσμοκράτωρ are used by St. Paul (Titus ii. 12; Eph. vi. 12) with a similar moral significance.

While it is right to lay stress upon the special development of the moral idea in the Johannine writings, we must not overlook the fact that the moral sense is prominent also in 1 Corinthians, which was written many years before any of the Johannine books (see especially ii. 12; v. 10; xi. 32). It should also be remembered that αἰών is used with a similar moral significance 4 times in the Gospels, and some 12 times by St. Paul, the idea being that of the present age (often ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος) and its interests, things temporal (*seculum*) as opposed to things eternal, while κόσμος acquires its moral significance in a slightly different way, representing human society organised apart from God (*mundus*). St. John, as Bishop Westcott notes (on St. John i. 10), never uses αἰών in the moral sense, while the Synoptists very seldom use κόσμος in that way.

Into the κόσμος, alienated from God and lying in darkness, Christ, according to St. John, was sent. He was to be the light of the whole κόσμος (in the wider sense), and was sent not to condemn it, but to save it. The effect of His coming is to separate those who love the light and answer to His call from those who prefer darkness and reject Him. Hence it brings about a separation and a judgment. The disciples, who are to carry on Christ's work, are also to be, like Him, the light of the World; and the Holy Spirit, whom He promises to send to them, is to convince the World concerning sin and righteousness and judgment. Thus we get a clear separation and contrast between the disciples and the World. We do not, it is true, find the actual words ἐκκλησία and κόσμος definitely contrasted in any single phrase of the New Testament, but the contrast between the body of faithful disciples, which constitutes the Church, and the mass of human society around them is strongly developed

both in St. Paul's Epistles and (even more emphatically) in the first Epistle of St. John. No language could be clearer than that in which both Apostles remind the Christian community of their corporate unity and of their separateness from the World (*e.g.* 1 Cor. v. 6; 1 St. John v. 19).

(See Grimm-Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, and Moulton-Geden, *Concordance to New Testament*, s.vv. αἰών and κόσμος; Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*; Westcott on St. John i. 10; Lowrie, *The Doctrine of St. John*, pp. 95-112 and 128-155; T. D. Bernard, *Central Teaching of Jesus Christ*, pp. 240-294.)

NOTE E

See p. 29

The New Testament Names for the Disciples

It may not be devoid of interest to examine the usage of the books of the New Testament with regard to the words which are employed to denote the members of the Church in the Apostolic age.

μαθηταί (learners, disciples), which is of constant occurrence in all four Gospels (as was natural when the disciples are more especially spoken of in relation to their Master), occurs 28 times in the Acts, but it is remarkable that it is not found in any passage in the Epistles or the Apocalypse.

ἀδελφοί (brethren), which in the Gospels is not used in a technical sense to differentiate the followers of Christ, occurs over 30 times in that sense in the Acts, and is frequent in the writings of St. Paul, St. James, St. John, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

ἀδελφότης (brotherhood) is peculiar to 1 St. Peter, where it occurs twice.

ἅγιοι (saints, *i.e.* men set apart for God's service) is applied to Christian believers only 4 times in the Acts, 3 of these being in ch. ix. It is a favourite expression with St. Paul, who uses it about 40 times; and it is found 14 times in the Apocalypse, twice in Hebrews, and once in St. Jude.

ἡ ὁδός (the way) is used 5 times in the Acts to denote the Church collectively (*e.g.* xxii. 4 *ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐδίωξα*), but it does not appear to be used in this sense elsewhere in the New Testament.

οἱ *πιστοί* (the faithful). It is sometimes difficult to decide when this word is applied in a technical or semi-technical sense to denote Christian disciples, but there appear to be some 15 passages in which it is thus used (in singular or plural) in the Epistles, and 2 passages in the Acts.

οἱ *ἐκλεκτοί* (the elect) is of rarer occurrence, being found in some seven passages in the Epistles in this sense.

Χριστιανοί only occurs 3 times—twice in the Acts and once in 1 St. Peter. In each case it is either used by non-Christians, or occurs with reference to such usage. The term was first applied in derision by the Greeks at Antioch, and St. Paul evidently ignores it in Acts xxvi. 29. In Acts xxiv. 5, we find the term *Ναζωραῖοι* applied to the Christians by the Jews. The statement as to the origin of the name "Christian," contained in Acts xi. 26, has been questioned on insufficient grounds by Baur, Hausrath, and others (see Hastings, *Dict. of Bible*, s.v. "Christian"). Possibly, as Mr. Rackham suggests in his note on Acts xi. 26, the nickname was applied with an ironical reference to *χρηστιανοί* ("worthy folk").

See Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, bk. iii. ch. iii., where there are some interesting suggestions as to the disuse, successively, in later times of the terms *μαθηταί*, *ἅγιοι*, *ἀδελφοί*, and the non-acceptance of οἱ *φίλοι* as a technical term.

NOTE F

See p. 29

The Use of *ἐκκλησία* in the New Testament

An analysis of the passages quoted in Moulton-Geden, *Concordance to the Greek Testament*, s.v. *ἐκκλησία*, yields the following results. The word *ἐκκλησία* occurs 115 times in the New Testament, but in 4 instances there is no reference in it to the

Christian Church. In 10 passages it bears the sense of an assembly for worship rather than that of the Christian community. It is used 3 times in the Synoptic Gospels (only in two separate passages), never in the fourth Gospel, 23 times in the Acts, 63 times in the Pauline Epistles, twice in Hebrews, once in St. James, 3 times in 3 St. John, 20 times in Revelation; and is not found at all in the remaining books. In 34 instances the word is used in the plural; in 25 cases it is found with the name of a city or district (*e.g.* 1 Thess. i. 1 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων), or of a person (Colossians iv. 15); in 13 cases we find the expression ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ (more rarely Χριστοῦ).

Dr. Hort, in his valuable work on *The Christian Ecclesia*, has explained the connection of the New Testament sense of the word ἐκκλησία with the Old Testament usage, and has accounted for the choice of the word to denote the Christian community. In view of an explanation of the word which is still of frequent occurrence in popular theology, it is well to recall his reminder that ἐκκλησία does *not* mean "a people or a number of individual men *called out* of the world or mankind." The *idea* is, as he says, sound and scriptural, but it cannot be supported by the usage of the word ἐκκλησία.

Dr. Hort has not only elucidated the usage of the word ἐκκλησία in the New Testament, but he has examined minutely the New Testament records of the growth and development of the Christian Society. It is not inconsistent with a profound respect for his greatness as a Biblical scholar to say that some parts of his treatment of the subject are unconvincing. Subsequent writers (*e.g.* Bishop Gore, *Ephesians*, pp. 267-271, and the late Dr. W. Bright, *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life*, pp. 13-58) have taken exception to several of his statements, and in particular to the way in which he minimises the apostolic authority, and indeed all ministerial authority. It is outside the purpose of these lectures to discuss the constitution of the ministry, but I cannot help thinking that Dr. Hort has seriously underestimated the extent of the apostolic authority and its effect as a unifying influence upon the Church, while he has overestimated the isolation and independence of the local ἐκκλησίαι.

The term ἐκκλησία would be applied first of all to the Christian community at Jerusalem, then to the little communities in Judaea, then to Antioch, then to the "churches" in Asia, etc., the Christian community in each place being the local representative of the whole Christian Society. The unity of the Church is not an afterthought brought about by a deliberate process of confederation on the part of a number of independent ἐκκλησίαι, as some modern writers conceive it to be It is true that it is not until the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians that we find St. Paul laying stress upon the Universal ἐκκλησία, and treating it theologically, but it is dangerous to press the argument from silence too far, and it must be remembered that there are some passages in earlier Epistles where the word is used in a general, if not in an emphatically universal, sense, *e.g.* Gal. i. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 9; and the same usage of the term occurs in Acts xii. 1; xx. 28 (see Gore, *op. cit.* p. 268). Dr. Hort rightly lays stress on the fact that in St. Paul's view, as stated in Ephesians, "the members which make up the One Ecclesia are not communities, but individual men," and that the relations of the One Ecclesia to the individuals are direct, not mediate (p. 168). But if the local ἐκκλησίαι had been as independent, and the apostolic authority as weak, as Dr. Hort pictures them, such a view as this would not have been in correspondence with the existing conditions.

NOTE G

See p. 33

The Date of the Apocalypse

Although I have indicated a decided preference for the view which assigns the Apocalypse to the reign of Domitian (probably about A.D. 95-96), it is impossible to ignore the fact that this view is not free from difficulty, and that an earlier date, *e.g.* in the reign of Nero or in that of Vespasian, has been advocated recently by several writers whose names deservedly carry great weight. A candid statement of the arguments for an earlier date will be found in Dr. Hort's (posthumously published) *Apocalypse of St.*

John, i.-iii. (Introduction, pp. xiv.-xxxiii., xxxvii.-xl.), and Dr. Sanday in his Preface to this work indicates his own inclination to return this view. On the same side may be quoted the opinions of Lightfoot, Westcott, Benson, and of Mr. B. W. Henderson (*Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*) among English scholars, and of Beyschlag, Weiss, and Mommsen among Continental scholars. The Domitianic date, on the other hand, has been accepted by Dr. Swete (*Apocalypse of St. John*, Introduction, pp. xcix.-cv.), Sir W. Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, ch. xiii., and *Letters to the Seven Churches*), and by Dr. Harnack (*Chronologie*, p. 245).

It is impossible here even to summarise exhaustively the arguments for and against the earlier date. I will only indicate two which seem to me to weigh down the balance on the side of the later date.

1. *Tradition.*—This may be stated in Dr. Hort's judicial words: "On the one hand the tradition as to Domitian is not unanimous; on the other it is the prevalent tradition, and it goes back to an author (Irenaeus) likely to be the recipient of a true tradition on the matter, who, moreover, connects it neither with Rome nor with an emperor's personal act. If external evidence alone could decide there would be a clear preponderance for Domitian."

2. *The Historical Situation.*—It is hardly too much to say that the prevalence of Caesar-worship is the key to a large portion of the Apocalypse (cp. ii. 13; xiii. 8, 15; xiv. 9; xv. 2; xvi. 13). There is a state of wide-spread persecution, and it is implied "that the persecutor is worshipped as a god by all people except the Christians" (Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 296). This idea of antagonism between the Church and the Empire is markedly different from that of St Paul or even of St. Peter; and the rapid spread of the imperial cult in the second half of the first century, and the assertion by Domitian of his own divinity, would account for the development of his antagonism. Ramsay, indeed, declares that "as a Christian document the Apocalypse is an impossibility about A.D. 70" (p. 301). The condition of the Asian Churches, again, with their manifest deterioration (as Dr. Swete notes), also points to a date later than the reign of Nero.

These arguments appear to me to outweigh all that can be

urged on the other side, although there is great force in Dr. Hort's contentions (1) that Nero "affected the imagination of the world" as Domitian, so far as is known, never did; and (2) that the "atmosphere of commotion" which the book breathes would suit the years 66-70 very well. And, undoubtedly, those who believe that the Apocalypse was written by the author of the Fourth Gospel would find it infinitely easier to account for the difference in style and for the grammatical solecisms of the Apocalypse, if they could show that the Apocalypse was written 20 or 30 years earlier than the Gospel. We must, however, be on our guard against allowing our views of the date of the Apocalypse to be coloured by any wish to facilitate the ascription of both works to the same writer.

Discussions as to the date of the Apocalypse have been complicated by theories as to composite authorship, and it has even been contended that the greater part of the book is a Jewish Apocalypse, which has been set in a Christian framework. Such theories give infinite scope for ingenuity, but are unconvincing and transitory; each in turn is devoured by something more ingenious and equally incapable of proof. The Apocalypse, it may safely be maintained, is a Christian document, with a unity of its own, although the writer was doubtless familiar with existing apocalypses and made free use of material derived from them.

LECTURE II

NOTE A

See p. 57

The Worship of the Roman Emperors

It is impossible within the limits of a note to discuss the significance of the imperial apotheosis in the history of Roman and Greco-Roman religion, or even to bring out in detail its bearing upon the persecution of the Christian Church and its influence upon Church history. As long ago as 1729 a dissertation on the *cultus* was published by J. D. Schoepflin (*De Apotheosi*, Argentor., 1730), but much new light has been thrown upon the subject by the discovery of inscriptions, and it is only in the last 30 or 40 years that the full importance of the subject has been realised. The literature of the subject is very considerable, but, so far as I know, there is no comprehensive treatment of it by any English writer, and it is my hope, if other claims permit, to be able to treat the question fully in a separate volume, especially as regards the bearing of the worship upon Christianity.

No writer with whom I am acquainted has treated the subject with such insight into its significance as Bishop Westcott in his Essay on "The Two Empires: The Church and the World" in his *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John*, pp. 250-282; and its importance for the interpretation of the Apocalypse is well brought out by Dr. Swete in the Introduction to his *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*, pp. lxxviii.-xciii., and in his notes on ch. xiii., and by Sir W. Ramsay in his *Letters to the Seven Churches* (especially chap. ix.) and his *Church in the Roman Empire* (see Index s.v. *Cultus*). For more systematic treatment of the subject

reference may be made to Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. and iii.; Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, p. 208; Preller-Jordan, *Römische Mythologie* (2nd ed.), vol. ii.; Beurlier, *Le Culte impériale, son histoire et son organisation depuis Auguste jusqu'à Justinien* (Paris, 1891—a valuable book, but difficult to procure). For the development of the cult in the province of Asia see V. Chapot, *La Province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie*; and for the evidence of coins, Eckhel, *Doctrina Nummorum*, vi. and viii. M. Gaston Boissier has an interesting general sketch of the subject in *La Religion romaine*, vol. i. References to other monographs or articles will be found in Dr. T. M. Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 341; Dr. Lindsay, following MM. Desjardins and Monceaux, maintains that the organisation of the Christian hierarchy was modelled on the earlier pagan hierarchy of the Imperial worship.

Dr. Bigg, in his *Origins of Christianity*, pp. 17-18, seems to underrate the significance of Caesar-worship when he speaks of it as "mainly formal and official," but he notices that it was the only universal religion, and was "the chief rock in the way of the ship of the Church." How frequently the demand to sacrifice to the Emperor, or to swear by his Genius or Fortune, was enforced as a text of loyalty, may be seen from the *Acta Martyrum*. Thus in the *Acta* given in O. von Gebhardt's *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten* we find this test applied in the cases of Polycarp (p. 5), the Scillitan Martyrs (p. 23), Apollonius (p. 47), Pionius (p. 103), and Achatius (p. 115).

The position in which faithful Christians were placed is well summed up by Bishop Westcott towards the close of the Essay mentioned above (p. 280):—"In such a view of humanity the Christian found the complete antithesis to that which had been revealed to him. He held indeed most firmly to the unity of humanity, but this was assured to him by the Incarnation. . . He could not acknowledge in the Emperor the centre of that larger being which he had found in all its fulness in Christ. He could not invoke the Genius—the demon—the spiritual essence of a power which stood forth as a rival of that to which he was devoted. . . . Thus the opposition of Christianity and imperialism

was complete and irrevocable. The two empires, when regarded in their principles, were seen to be utterly irreconcilable." (Cp. Tertullian, *Apol.* chs. 28-35.)

NOTE B

See p. 62

The Number of the Martyrs

It is impossible, as has been remarked in the text, to form any numerical estimate of the frequency of martyrdom. There seems to me, however, to be a real danger lest a reaction against the exaggeration of martyrologies and the vague rhetoric of writers like Tertullian should cause the frequency of martyrdom to be quite unduly suspected. Among recent writers, Harnack (*Mission and Expansion*, book iii. ch. v.), and Bishop Westcott (*The Two Empires*, ch. vii.), seem inclined to regard actual martyrdom as relatively infrequent, though both of them speak mainly of the period before 250, and both appreciate to the full the effect of the heroic witness borne by those who did suffer.

As far as the argument from *probability* is permissible in such a case, it is surely in favour of martyrdom having been frequent. When we consider the fact that from Nero to Galerius all Christians were potentially outlaws; when we enumerate the recorded outbreaks of persecution, and estimate their geographical extent, which in many cases is very imperfectly known to us; more especially when we take into account the sweeping and rigorous edicts of the later persecutions, and the large increase in the number of Christians in the last half of the third century,—it would be strange indeed if the result had been that only a few hundred or a few thousand Christians were put to death, even though it is true that many magistrates preferred to make an example of a few rather than to exterminate whole congregations of believers.

As regards the last great persecution, the contemporary testimony of Eusebius affords the strongest proofs of wholesale martyrdoms throughout the East. He seldom gives actual figures,

but the eighth book of his *Ecclesiastical History* (especially chs. iv., vi., viii., xi.) teems with such expressions as μύριοι, μύριον πλῆθος, πλῆθος ἄθρουν, and he emphasises very clearly both the wide-spread character of the persecution and the immense variety of punishments which were inflicted. The evidence of Eusebius may be discounted as loose or partial, but cannot be wholly neglected. For the persecutions under Decius and Valerian the evidence is less detailed, but the letters of Dionysius of Alexandria preserved by Eusebius (vi. 42 and vii. 11) are of great value and point to widespread suffering. Before the time of Decius the number of victims was no doubt smaller, but too much weight has been attached to the sentence in which Origen declared that few had perished for their religion. He is arguing that it was not God's will that Christianity should be extirpated, and the expression must be taken in a relative sense. As to the testimony of Tertullian, it is true that his expressions are rhetorical, and that he only mentions two martyrs by name; but his *Apology*, his *Ad Martyres*, and other of his works would be utterly lacking in point and verisimilitude if martyrdom were the rare and exceptional thing which some historians maintain it to have been. Clement of Alexandria asserts the frequency of martyrdom under Septimius Severus (*Stromateis*, ii. 125), and the second Apology of Justin implies that the death-penalty was common under Marcus Aurelius. And, as M. Allard remarks, the Apocalypse is inexplicable except on the supposition that many Christians had already suffered under Domitian. M. Allard has stated the case for believing in the comparative frequency of actual martyrdom very cogently in his *Dix Leçons sur le martyre*, pp. 134-149, where he has collected references; but perhaps the historian of persecutions may be thought to be a prejudiced witness. No such suspicion can attach to the opinion expressed by M. Boissier (*Fin du paganisme*, i. 456):—

"Je suis frappé de voir qu'il n'y a pas un seul écrit ecclésiastique, quel que sujet qu'il traite, depuis le 1^er^ siècle jusqu'au iii^e^, où il ne soit question de quelque violence contre les Chrétiens. . . . Nous venons de voir que les écrivains profanes ne parlent guère des Chrétiens, mais le hasard veut que toutes les fois qu'ils

en disent un mot, c'est pour faire allusion aux châtiments qu'on leur inflige."

I am persuaded that a closer study of the history of this period will not encourage scepticism as to the frequency of actual martyrdom; nor must it be forgotten that beside those who suffered death there were multitudes who incurred the penalties of confiscation, banishment, labour in mines, mutilation, and torture, *martyres sine sanguine* (Allard, *op. cit.* p. 149).

NOTE C

See p. 66

The Belief in the Nearness of the "Parousia," and its Effects

Whatever view may be held with regard to the true meaning of the eschatological teaching of our Lord, there can be no reasonable doubt that the first generation of Christians, including the Apostles themselves, believed that the Second Coming would take place very shortly, within their own lifetime or that of many of their contemporaries. Such, plainly, was the prevalent belief of St. Paul. His eschatological teaching is not systematic or entirely consistent. In some passages (*e.g.* Phil. i. 23) he seems to anticipate his own death before the Second Coming, but these passages are rarer and less emphatic than those in which he speaks of the *Parousia* as imminent, *e.g.* 1 Thess. iii. 13, iv. 15 ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Κυρίου, v. 23; Rom. xiii. 11, 12; Phil. iv. 5. This belief was not peculiar to St. Paul: the expectation of a speedy *Parousia* is implied throughout the Apocalypse, and appears in the Petrine Epistles (I. iv. 7; II. iii. 10). It was also part of the Apostolic teaching that though the "Day of the Lord" would come soon, it would come suddenly and unexpectedly (1 Thess. v. 1; 2 St. Peter iii. 10).

It is plain that the existence (and subsequently the gradual disappearance) of this belief must have influenced the Church profoundly in different ways. (1) As is maintained in the text, the belief quickened zeal and acted as a preservative against worldliness.

(2) It tended to an excessive aloofness from human interests, culture, and learning. (3) It discouraged any immediate development of Church organization beyond what was necessary for immediate needs; thus the constitution of the Church was not stereotyped by Apostolic ordinances. (4) Sometimes the expectation seems to have produced a spirit of restlessness and neglect of work, as was apparently the case at Thessalonica (2 Thess. iii. 6-12).

The disappearance of the belief was gradual. In some minds, perhaps, after A.D. 70 the thought might arise that the destruction of Jerusalem had fulfilled a portion at least of the apocalyptic anticipations of the *Parousia*, but the belief was not extinguished until long after that date. Its disappearance, as Mr. Vernon Bartlet notes (*Apostolic Age*, p. 299), "changed the perspective of many things, a fact too often forgotten." The revival of the belief was one of the early features of Montanism.

See Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, note on ch. xiii. 11-14; G. Milligan, *Thessalonians*, notes *ad loc.*, and special note on usage of παρουσία, pp. 144-148; Vernon Bartlet, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 299, 309, 472; Dobschütz, *Christian Life in Primitive Church*, pp. 91, 95.

NOTE D

See p. 71

The Usage and Meaning of the Word "Catholic"

The earliest instance of καθολική as an epithet of ἐκκλησία occurs, as is well known, in Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* 8 ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Here, as the context shows, the sense is simply that of "universality." Christ is represented as standing to the universal Church in the same relation as the bishop to the particular or local Church (see Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 413 f., and ii. 310 f.). As Lightfoot points out, no anachronism is involved, for the *idea* as opposed to the *term* "Catholic" is already present in St. Paul's Epistles, and the word καθολικός was lying ready to hand, being in common use in the time of Ignatius in the sense of

"universal" as opposed to "partial." The expression καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία does not occur again in Christian literature until the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (about A.D. 155), where it is found three times in the sense of "universal," while in a fourth passage (§ 16 ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας) it must, if genuine, be interpreted in the later and technical sense, "the Catholic Church," *i.e.* as opposed to heretical sects. The reading ἁγίας is probably the original one, and if this be so, there is no certain instance of the technical use of the epithet until the *Muratorian Fragment* (about A.D. 200), where the use is so well established that "catholica" even stands by itself for "catholica ecclesia," and the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria (vii. 17), where its application is explicitly connected with "unity of faith." In the third and fourth centuries, amidst the pressure of schisms, the technical usage hardened, and the epithet is used to connote orthodoxy as opposed to heresy, and unity as opposed to schism, rather than to lay stress on universality. But the connection of the technical with the original sense is easily intelligible, for the heretical sects are contrasted, as local and partial, with the Church, which is one and universal and maintains the "*fides catholica*." In the fourth century we meet with several discussions as to the usage of the word. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* xviii. 23) gives three reasons for its use: (1) the true derivation; (2) because the Church teaches καθολικῶς all the doctrines that man needs; (3) because it heals καθολικῶς every kind of sin. This is not history, but edifying rhetoric. Pacian, who was Bishop of Barcelona about 370, in a letter entitled *De Catholico Nomine*, addressed to Sympronianus, a Novatian, deals with the objection that the name Catholic was not used by the Apostles, and explains that its use was caused by the prevalence of heresy. If he were to enter a great city and find several different Christian bodies, how could he distinguish the true Church except by inquiring for the "Catholic" Church? "*Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero cognomen*," he writes (*Epist. ad Sympron.* i.). The Donatist controversy did much to draw out the full significance of the term. Cp. Optatus, *De Schism. Donat.* book ii., and St. Augustine, *De Vera Religione*, xii.; *Contra Epist. quam vocant Fundamenti*, iv.; *Epist.* 93.

In any discussion of the term "Catholic" it must be borne in mind that a writer may be imbued with the idea of Catholicity, and yet not use the word. This appears to be the case with Irenaeus, in whose treatise *Adversus Haereses* we find a defence of the principle without any occurrence of the epithet.

In addition to the notes in Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, see also Harnack, *History of Dogma*, English trans., ii. 75; the passages quoted in Pearson, *History of the Creed*, art. ix.; and articles s.v. "Catholic," in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, vol. ii., and the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, fascic. xvi.

NOTE E

See p. 75

The Classes of Society from which Converts were Drawn

Heathen opponents of Christianity in the second century made it a matter of reproach that Christianity was a religion for the lower classes, the slaves, the poor and the ignorant (cp. Origen, *c. Celsum*, iii. 44, 55, and Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, ch. viii., "de ultima faece"). As Gibbon remarks (ch. xv. vol. ii. 65, ed. Bury), this imputation is "less strenuously denied by the Apologists than it is urged by the adversaries of the faith"; indeed, the Apologists acknowledge the fact, and regard it as an honour to Christianity, in the same spirit as St. Paul in 1 Cor. i. 26, 27. Modern research has not brought to light any evidence which would lead us to doubt the predominance of the "lower classes" in the Early Church; but we must not overlook the fact that even with our fragmentary evidence we know of a considerable number of exceptions, and it is necessary to distinguish carefully between different periods. Among the believers named in the New Testament there are evidently some of culture and social position, and the Epistle of St. James implies the presence of men of wealth in the congregation, while Pliny in writing to Trajan speaks of "multi omnis ordinis." Domitian's first cousin, Flavius Clemens, with his wife Domitilla was among the early converts, possibly also Acilius Glabrio and Pomponia Graecina. Towards the end of the second

century there was, as Harnack points out, a distinct stage when Christianity began to spread more freely among all classes, and in the middle of the third century the rescript of Valerian gives the plainest evidence of its hold upon men of high social and official rank. The fullest and best discussion of the subject is to be found in Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, book iv. ch. ii., "On the Inward Spread of Christianity," where ample references are given to ancient writers. Reference may also be made to Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. xv.; Newman, *Grammar of Assent*, ch. x. § 9; Lightfoot, *Clement*, i. 30, 61, 2; Bigg, *Origins of Christianity*, p. 258; Henderson, *Nero*, p. 344; T. R. Glover, *Conflict of Religions*, p. 263; Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 203; Allard, *Dix Leçons*, Leçon 5me. The subject is one which would repay detailed investigation, and in any discussion of it the decisive effect of the development of Christian learning at Alexandria in winning the educated classes must not be overlooked (Harnack, *op. cit.* vol. ii. p. 42).

NOTE F

See p. 77

The Causes alleged for the Growth of the Christian Church

The five main causes of the growth of Christianity alleged by Gibbon in the celebrated chapter (xv.) of his *Decline and Fall* are (1) the zeal of the Christians, derived from Judaism; (2) the doctrine of a future state; (3) the claim to miraculous powers; (4) the virtues of the early Christians; (5) the effective organisation of the Church. Gibbon admits that these are "secondary causes" (ii. 54, ed. Bury), but his argument was intended to explain how Christianity might thus have spread without supernatural power or intrinsic truth. As Newman justly remarked (*Grammar of Assent*, ch. x. § 9), Gibbon did not think of accounting for the combination of these "causes" in a single religion. He did not ask such questions as how a multitude of Gentiles came to be influenced by Jewish zeal, or what made them austerely virtuous,

or what disposed them to submit to a strict ecclesiastical *régime*. He simply selected five historical *characteristics* of Christianity. These characteristics may have had (one may admit) more efficacy in producing conversions than Newman allowed, but the marvel of the victory of the Church is not explained away by enumerating them.

In Harnack's *Mission and Expansion*, book ii., we have a deeper and more penetrating analysis of the characteristics of Christian "mission preaching" for the conversion of the world, and it is based on a foundation of vast historical knowledge. The main points are summed up on p. 312; among them are the Fatherhood of God, the Gospel of the Saviour and of Salvation, the Resurrection, the Gospel of Love and Charity, the preaching of moral earnestness and holiness, the combination of authority and faith, of reason, "mysteries," and a sacred book, and the assertion of the appearance of a "new people." Here again we have to do with *verae causae*, and it is easy to see that such characteristics may have had powerful attractions for certain minds, though it is equally true that many of them must have been repellent to minds of a contrary type. But here also we find no explanation of the co-existence of all these features in a single religion of apparently humble origin, and the fact is not accounted for by calling Christianity "syncretistic," which, in the true sense, it never was.

Whatever relative values we may assign to different characteristics of Christianity, three things may be said with truth of its growth in the early period:—

(1) That Christianity "met the need of the world at the time" (in Professor Bury's words, *Later Roman Empire*, i. 4) when other religions failed to meet it.

(2) That it accomplished this without minimising its claim or compromising its principles. It did not attract men by showing them how to avoid effort or sacrifice.

(3) That the corporate aspect of Christianity was emphasised, and that while on the one hand this was a main cause of opposition and of persecution, it was also a powerful attraction. Men needed not only a creed, but a life, and a society in which to live.

I cannot refrain from quoting some words of Mr. B. W.

Henderson (*Nero*, p. 857), which seem to me to be eminently true:—

"We admit the vigorous secondary causes of its growth, but we have left its origin unexplained, and cannot but see as well the vigour and strength of the foes which willed its destruction and powerfully dissuaded from its acceptance. And there exists for us as historians no secondary or human cause or combination of causes sufficient to account for the triumph of Christianity."

LECTURE III

NOTE A

See p. 107

The Meaning of "*Paganus*"

Until recent years the traditional explanation of *paganus* = "villager" was universally accepted, and it was supposed to be an evidence of the fact that Christianity made its way first in the cities and towns of the Empire, while the villages and country districts remained heathen, so that "villager" became a synonym for non-Christian. Gieseler supposed that the Government forced the adherents of paganism to live in villages, and Baronius that they were reduced to the status of peasants. (See Chastel, *Destruction du paganisme*, p. 174.) But new light has been thrown on the question by Zahn and Harnack, and the arguments in favour of a wholly different derivation are quite convincing. See the important article by Zahn in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, January 1899, pp. 18 f.; and cp. Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, ii. pp. 416-418, and his *Militia Christi* (Tübingen, 1905), p. 68 f. *Paganus* is to be interpreted in the sense of "civilian" as opposed to *miles*. The soldier was regarded as the *miles Christi*, bound by the *sacramentum* of his baptismal vow; the non-Christian was a mere "civilian" in the sight of God. *Paganus* was current in this sense; perhaps, as Dr. Bigg suggests, it was originally "the slang of the barrack-room" which dubbed all civilians "rustics." Thus in its origin this usage of *paganus* had nothing to do with the survival of heathenism in country districts; but the true origin of the word became obscured, especially in Greek-speaking countries, and the current explana-

tion was adopted in view of the fact that the country districts remained heathen longer. The strength of the argument for the explanation of *paganus* as = "civilian" can only be appreciated when we realise the prevalence of the idea that every Christian was a *miles Christi*. Harnack has elucidated this in a most striking way in his monograph, especially in connection with the attitude of Christians towards service in the army. Perhaps the most important passages in patristic literature which bear upon the question are in Tertullian, *De Corona Militis*, especially ch. xi.: "Apud hunc tam miles est paganus fidelis quam paganus est miles infidelis. Non admittit status fidei necessitates"; *i.e.* in God's eyes every civilian is a soldier of Christ, and every soldier (of the Emperor's) is a "civilian," *i.e.* a non-Christian.

The ordinary derivation of "heathen" and "*Heiden*" has usually been quoted as a parallel to the traditional interpretation of *paganus*, but it now seems probable that *Heiden* is merely a version of ἔθνη (Harnack, *Mission and Expansion*, ii. p. 418). From New Testament times ἔθνη had been used for the heathen, translated into Latin as *gentes*, *gentiles*; but from the time of Julian Ἑλληνισμός, Ἕλληνες, were widely used of the old religion and its adherents. *Paganus* is officially used in legislation in the Theodosian Codex from the later years of the fourth century.

NOTE B

See p. 110

Patristic Opinions on Tolerance and Coercion during the Period from Constantine to Justinian

Numerous references to the opinions of the Fathers on the subject of religious coercion may be found in modern writers on persecution and kindred subjects, especially Jeremy Taylor, *Liberty of Prophesying*, section 14; Lecky, *Rationalism*, vol. ii. p. 12 f.; H. C. Lea, *History of the Inquisition*, i. pp. 211 f.; Döllinger, *Historical and Literary Addresses*, lecture vi.; Lord Acton, *History of Freedom*, pp. 197 f.; Creighton, *Persecution and Tolerance*, lecture iii.; cp. Neander, *Church History*, vol. iii. (Some of the references I have been unable to verify in Migne.) In order to estimate the value

of any utterance in favour of religious freedom it is plainly necessary to bear in mind whether it dates from before or after the Edict of Milan, and if after that date, to understand the circumstances of the writer: a Catholic writer, for instance, when exposed to the fury of Arian persecution under such an Emperor as Valens, was predisposed by his circumstances to claim freedom; and it must be remembered that several of the passages which are commonly cited have reference to the treatment, not of pagans, but of heretics.

The defence of religious freedom by Tertullian and Lactantius has been already noted. Of these, Tertullian lived during a time of severe persecution, and Lactantius had been an eye-witness of the great and final persecution, and though he outlived it, he probably wrote his *Divinae Institutiones* before the Edict of Milan. Among fourth-century Fathers we find Hilary of Poitiers, in his appeal to Constantius (about A.D. 356), maintaining the principle, "Deus . . . obsequio non eget necessario, non requirit coactam confessionem"; but Hilary is appealing for protection for the orthodox against Arians. The same qualification holds good as to the utterances of Athanasius, who had been so often himself the victim of persecution. More weight should be attached to Chrysostom's dictum in *De S. Babyla*, 3, οὐδὲ γὰρ θέμις Χριστιανοῖς ἀνάγκῃ καὶ βίᾳ καταστρέφειν τὴν πλάνην, ἀλλὰ καὶ πειθοῖ καὶ λόγῳ καὶ προσηνείᾳ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐργάζεσθαι σωτηρίαν, which was written with reference to paganism; but, if he did not sanction the persecution of individuals, he approved of the destruction of temples and of depriving pagans of all means of worship, and he only tolerated heretics so far as to disapprove of a death-penalty for them.

The work of Firmicus Maternus, *De Errore Profanarum Religionum*, which was an appeal to Constantius and Constans to eradicate heathenism, is perhaps the first definite vindication of forcible conversion (about A.D. 347). It was, as Döllinger observes, the influence of St. Augustine which counted for most in commending the principle of compulsory conversion, and St. Augustine has recorded that he had changed his earlier view, which favoured freedom (*In Joann. Ev.* xxvi. 2; *Retract.* x. v.; *Epist.* 93), because he had seen coercion successfully applied to the

Donatists, though he supports his new view by manifold perversions of Scripture. More than once he justifies coercion of heretics by the text "compelle intrare" (cp. *Epist.* 93, 185), although he objected to the infliction of capital punishment. St. Augustine's confession that he was led by experience to change his opinion is instructive. In the last half of the fourth century and the opening years of the fifth the severity of Valens against the Catholics, and of Theodosius and his successors against paganism, had familiarised men with the idea of coercion. At first they shrank from actual bloodshed, and the execution of Priscillian for heresy (or magic) was vehemently resisted by St. Martin; but the objection was to the severity of the sentence rather than to the principle of force, and St. Martin himself was prominent in the work of forcibly destroying heathen temples and worship. Augustine was not blind to the dangers of nominal Christianity (cp. *Enarr. in Psalm.* xxx. 2, 6, 11), but he was misled by the hope that those who were converted from unworthy motives would be improved by subsequent training ("multi etiam sic intrantes corriguntur ingressi"), or that at all events their children would become real Christians, a hope also expressed by Gregory the Great ("aut ipsos ergo aut eorum filios lucramur," *Epist.* v. 8).

St. Ambrose is sometimes quoted as a champion of tolerance, and he certainly refused communion to those who were responsible for the execution of Priscillian; but he reproved Theodosius the Great for his fairness towards the Jews (*Epist.* xl.), and he urged Gratian to throw the weight of imperial favour more decidedly against paganism and for Christianity. Mr. Lea regards as a critical turning-point the action of Leo I. in 447, only sixty-two years after the execution of Priscillian, when he declared it to be essential that heresy should be extirpated by enforcing the death-penalty (Leo. I. *Epist.* 15, *ad Tyrribium*), and he adds: "It is impossible not to attribute to ecclesiastical influence the successive edicts by which, from the time of Theodosius the Great, persistence in heresy was punished with death" (*op. cit.* i. 215). This statement is made with regard to heresy, not paganism, but the same might be said with truth of the forcible suppression of paganism from Theodosius to Justinian.

NOTE C

See p. 115

Survivals of Paganism in Christianity

The effect of coercion or of wholesale conversion in producing a blend of pagan customs and observances with Christian profession and worship is a subject of great interest and importance, which needs thorough investigation. It is impossible to state the evidence here, or to add details beyond those which are given in the text and notes of lectures iii. and iv. Several of these illustrations are derived from a learned and useful article by Mr. J. Bass Mullinger in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, s.v. "Paganism" (cp. *ibid.* s.v. "Magic" and "Patron Saints"). Nobody who follows up the references which are given there to the complaints of Christian bishops and writers, or to the decrees of Councils, or to the Capitularies of Charles the Great, or to the indications in Christian ritual itself, can doubt the wide operation of pagan influences, owing to the wholesale absorption of unconverted heathen into the Christian Church. Special aspects of the question have been dealt with by various writers, *e.g.* Conyers Middleton, *Letter from Rome* (4th ed., 1741); Marangoni, *Delle cose gentilesche e profane trasportate ad uso e adornamento delle Chiese* (1744); *Les Saints successeurs des Dieux*, by P. Saintyves, Paris, 1907. Harnack (*Mission and Expansion*, ii. 206 f.) notes the earlier stages of the process in connection with Gregory Thaumaturgus, and observes that he is the only missionary of the first three centuries who is known to have employed the method of "accommodation" to paganism; but his example was largely followed in the fourth and fifth centuries, and Theodoret describes in the plainest words the wholesale substitution of Christian martyrs for heathen deities (*Graec. Affect. Curat.* viii. *ad fin.*). Other valuable references will be found in the index at the end of Harnack's work, s.v. *Paganism*. Cp. also Beugnot, *Destruction du paganisme*, ii. book xii.; Chastel, *Destruction*, pp. 310 f.; Lecky, *Rationalism*, ch. i.; and incidental allusions in general

Church histories, *e.g.* Milman, *Latin Christianity*; and Neander, *Church History*, vols. iii.-v.

In considering the ultimate effects of this process upon the Church it must, of course, be remembered, as Harnack points out (*op. cit.* i. p. 316), that the question is not merely what amount of superstition the Church took over, but what was the result of her borrowings. Those who have travelled in Southern Europe, *e.g.* in Spain, Sicily, Calabria, or Greece, will probably have noticed many traces of pagan survivals in popular religion, folk-lore, and custom. It is said, for instance, that in Spain on All Souls' Day the customs of the pagan Νεμέσια are observed, and that the sacred effigy in the Cathedral of Santiago is absolutely identical with the "Martis simulacrum" called "Neton," of which Macrobius (*Sat.* i. 19) speaks (cp. Ford, *Handbook for Spain*, 1st ed., pp. 18, 109, 168, 609). In the year 1885 the present writer was in an out-of-the-way village in Sicily, where he was told that the image of the patron saint had recently been flogged and disgraced because of a failure of the crops—a modern parallel to the way in which St. Martin of Tours was invoked after the manner of a pagan deity: "If thou dost not perform what I request, we will here burn for thee no more lamps, nor pay thee any honours at all" (Gregory of Tours, *de Miraculis Martini*, iii. 8, quoted by Neander, v. 183)

LECTURE IV

NOTE A

See p. 133

The Influence of St. Augustine upon Religious Coercion

Something has been said elsewhere of the nature of St. Augustine's later and deliberately changed opinions on the subject of coercion (lecture iii., Appendix, Note B, pp. 373, 374). St. Augustine's argument is stated fully in two very lengthy epistles (93 to Vincentius and 185 to Bonifacius; cp. *Contra Gaudentium*, 20, and *Epist. Parmen.* i. 16), and is subjected to a detailed examination and refutation in vol. ii. of Bayle's *Commentaire philosophique sur les paroles "Contrains-les d'entrer"* (Rotterdam, 1713). Briefly, St. Augustine approved (*a*) of the forcible suppression of paganism, (*b*) of the coercion of heretics (*e.g.* the Donatists), although he stopped short of claiming the enforcement of the death-penalty in their case.

The reasons advanced by St. Augustine are mainly these: (*a*) that coercion had proved singularly effective in regard to the Donatists; (*b*) that it is justified by many scriptural texts and precedents both in the Old and New Testaments; (*c*) that it is right to destroy religious error, to prevent a madman from doing himself harm, to drag a man out of a falling house, to save men from eternal punishment even against their will (cp. *Epist.* 185, ch. 2 "quanto magis homo ab homine, et frater a fratre, *ne in eternum pereat*, non est deserendus, qui correctus intelligere potest quantum sibi praestabatur beneficium, quando se persecutionem perpeti querebatur"). Hence, he concludes (*ibid.*), "est persecutio injusta quam faciunt impii Ecclesiae Christi; et est justa persecutio quam faciunt impiis Ecclesiae Christi."

It is quite impossible for anyone to contend that St. Augustine's reasons for persecution have anything to do with political necessity or expediency; his argument is religious throughout: it is a question of salvation, which is to be enforced by coercion if it is not accepted voluntarily. It is better, no doubt, that men should be led by persuasion or by love; "sed sicut meliores sunt quos dirigit amor, ita plures sunt quos corrigit timor" (*Ep.* 185, ch. 6). This is a fact of great importance in the history of persecution, and a grave difficulty in the way of accepting the theory that persecution in its early stages was political rather than religious. For none of the early Fathers discussed the question so fully as St. Augustine, and none exercised so profound an influence over the Church, and especially over the Western portion of the Church. We know how this was the case in such matters as Biblical Exegesis, Inspiration, and Predestination (cp. Dr. Cunningham, *St. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought* (1886), Appendix, Excursus B and G). It is not the less true of his influence on the attitude of the Church towards persecution and religious coercion. This has been recognised very generally by modern writers. It was for this reason that Bayle thought it worth while to examine St. Augustine's arguments so minutely. Mr. Lecky speaks of him as "the framer and representative of the system of intolerance," "the master intellect of the Church" (*Rationalism*, ii. p. 22), and from a very different standpoint Dr. Döllinger (*Historical and Literary Addresses*, lecture vi.) acknowledges the weight of his great authority on the side of coercion. His arguments were applied literally by Bossuet to justify persecution in France in 1685-6. Cp. Sparrow Simpson, *St. Augustine and African Church Divisions*, pp. 147-150.

NOTE B

See p. 148

Other Instances of Forcible or Wholesale Conversion

The illustrations of forcible or wholesale conversion of barbarian nations which have been given in the text are only a few

of the best known or the most striking. Any one who wishes to satisfy himself that they are in no way exceptional will have no difficulty in obtaining other instances *ad libitum*, or even *ad nauseam*. A comprehensive and critical history of the conversion of Europe is still a desideratum, and it is somewhat remarkable that in the present revival of missionary interest and study so little attention should have been paid to the records of the methods employed for many centuries in the evangelisation of the barbarian nations. But sufficient evidence is accessible, scattered through various Church histories: *e.g.* Neander, vols. v. and vii.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vols. ii., iii., and vii.; Hardwick, *Church History*, *Middle Age*, chs. i., v., ix., xv., where many references are given to original authorities which I have not had leisure to verify. Cp. also G. F. Maclear, *History of Christian Missions* and *Apostles of Mediaeval Europe*. Reference to such works as these will make it plain that, although great missionaries often showed a distrust of coercive methods, such methods were employed, at one time or another, over an enormous area of Central and Northern Europe. Distinct traces of such processes having been applied may be found in the following countries or districts,—and the list could, no doubt, easily be expanded by any one who made a more careful investigation:—Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Bohemia, Pomerania, Rügen, Livonia, Esthonia, Lithuania, Friesland, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, the Wends, and the Northmen. Often in the lives of missionaries there may be found candid admissions as to the nature of the results—*e.g.* "plerique nomine tenus Christiani ritu Gentilium vivunt" (*Life of Adalbert of Prague*); "miscebatur cum paganismo polluta religio, et coepit esse deterior barbarismo languidus ac tepidus Christianismus" (*ibid.*). The violence of the reaction, which was often apparent, is testified by the statement of a chronicler about the Slavi, who became so hostile to Christianity, "ut prius maluerint mori quam Christianitatis titulum resumere" (Hardwick, *op. cit.* p. 129).

It is impossible to treat in detail the methods of evangelisation applied to "inferior races" in the New World in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but it should not be forgotten that there also violent and wholesale methods were applied on a vast scale

The aims and methods of Cortés, who proclaimed the conversion of the natives to be the principal motive of his expedition, may be traced in Prescott's *History of the Conquest of Mexico.* The conquerors of America, writes Prescott (ii. p. 331), "carried with them the sword in one hand and the Bible in the other. They imposed obedience in matters of faith, no less than of government, on the vanquished, little heeding whether the conversion were genuine, so that it conformed to the outward observances of the Church." One missionary claimed that nine million people had been converted in twenty years. At the same time it must be remembered that some devoted missionaries saw the necessity of using more spiritual methods, and the great Las Casas was foremost in denouncing the use of force. Indeed Prescott (*Conquest of Peru*, ii. p. 6) contrasts the beneficence of the Spanish missionaries and their interest in the spiritual welfare of their natives with the cruelty of the conquerors and the colonists.

For an interesting account of Las Casas' treatise *De Unico Vocationis Modo*, and of his experiment of conversion by peaceful persuasion in the *Tierra di Guerra*, see Sir A. Helps, *Life of Las Casas*, ch. ix. His estimate of Las Casas is worth quoting:—

"At a period when brute force was universally appealed to in all matters, but especially in those that pertained to religion, he contended before Juntas and Royal Councils that missionary enterprise is a thing that should stand independent of all military support; that a missionary should go forth with his life in his hand, relying only on the protection that God will give him, and depending neither on civil nor military assistance. In fact his works would, even in the present day, form the best manual extant for missionaries."

The labours of St. Francis Xavier, "Apostle of the Indies and Japan," afford a conspicuous instance of the policy of wholesale baptism apart from the use of force. Xavier himself recorded that in India he baptised multitudes, until his arms and his voice failed him; and although he stayed only a few months in Travancore, it was said that he found it entirely heathen and left it entirely Christian (*Life of St. Francis Xavier*, by D. Bartoli and J. P. Maffei; Eng. trans., 1858, pp. 73, 99). The list of countries

in which this intrepid and noble-hearted missionary preached within the space of twelve years would alone be a sufficient condemnation of his method, and it is not surprising to hear how soon the traces of his conversions disappeared in India. Cp. Bishop Mylne, *Missions to Hindus*, ch. iv. Xavier's policy, it must be added, became a favourite one with Jesuit missionaries. The more careful methods of Las Casas found fewer imitators.

NOTE C

See p. 151

The Treatment of Mahommedans and Jews by the Church

There appears to be a tendency in some writers to exaggerate the amount of tolerance shown towards Mahommedans and Jews by the mediaeval Church, although it is clear that their case was often differentiated from those of the heathen on one side and of Christian heretics on the other. With regard to Mahommedans, it must be remembered that they appeared on the scene later than the Jews, and that the opportunities of persecution were far rarer, since there were comparatively few Mahommedans who were subjects of any Christian state. The Crusades, however, were to a large extent the expression of a desire to destroy their religion by force; and this desire was accentuated by the fact that Mahommedanism had propagated itself by the sword and thus provoked reprisals. St. Bernard of Clairvaux, at the very moment when he pleaded for toleration of the Jews, was preaching the Second Crusade, and argued that, although it was fitting for the Church to spare the conquered Jew (*parcere subjectis*), it was bound to strike down the proud infidel (*debellare superbos*), (*Epist.* 363). Two centuries and a half later, when opportunity arose in Spain for persecution on a large scale, full advantage was taken of it by Cardinal Ximenes under Ferdinand and Isabella, and the Moors had the choice of banishment, serfdom, or conversion. It is recorded that many thousands were baptised wholesale under this pressure (Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, part ii. chs. 6, 7; Hardwick, *Church History, Middle Age*, pp. 340 f.).

The case of the Jews was widely different. From the fourth century to the eighteenth they were everywhere an easy mark for persecution, and were persecuted on a vast scale, though with many intermissions and exceptions. Disabilities were imposed upon Jews as early as Theodosius II. (see *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 8, *passim*), and Cyril of Alexandria encouraged a policy of pillage and expulsion in 415 (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 13). Decrees of Councils were directed against them; they were exposed alike to outbursts of popular hatred and to the pious bigotry of rulers like St. Louis, or of Churchmen like Isidore or Peter of Cluny. In many parts of Europe they were compelled to wear a distinctive dress, to live in a separate quarter, and to submit to various social and commercial restrictions. On the other hand, several of the popes condemned the persecution of the Jews and relied upon milder methods. We have already seen that this was the policy of Gregory the Great (cp. Dudden, *Gregory the Great*, ii. pp. 151-155), and his example was followed by Innocent II., Innocent IV., Gregory IX., Alexander II., and Alexander VI., while St. Bernard and some of the Franciscans also endeavoured to stem the tide of fanatical zeal against them (St. Bernard, *Epist.*, *loc. cit.*). It was urged on their behalf that there was a promise of their future restoration, or that Judaism was really a confirmation of the Christian faith. And even those who justified their persecution (like Peter of Cluny, who held them to be worse than the Saracens) stopped short of asking that they should be put to death or banished, though they wished them to live in shame and misery and to be deprived of their wealth.

It appears to be impossible, therefore, to discover any consistent or generally accepted principle with regard to the Jews, but the extent of their sufferings is not open to any doubt, and their ill-treatment was not merely due to popular outbursts, but was often sanctioned by civil legislation and by ecclesiastical authority. Their most severe persecution was in Spain at the end of the fifteenth century, under Isabella and Torquemada, when thousands were massacred, and scores of thousands banished, while a great number accepted compulsory conversion. In the case both of the Jews and of the Mahommedans it can be shown

that their persecution was not wholly or mainly political, but was chiefly the result of misguided religious zeal.

Reference may be made to Lecky, *Rationalism*, ii. pp. 298 f.; Neander, *Church History*, vii. pp. 97 f. (to these two writers many of the examples above are due); Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, part i. chs. 7 and 17; Lea, *History of Inquisition in Spain*, vol. i. book i. chs. 3 and 4. Mr. Lea gives an exhaustive history of the treatment of the Jews from early times onwards.

NOTE D

See p. 156

The Influence of Old Testament Precedents upon the Theory of Persecution

It is not, perhaps, sufficiently realised in how many directions the literal application of Old Testament examples and precedents has exercised a distorting influence upon Christian theology and morality. In recent times this tendency has been checked by the growth of a more historical view of the Bible and of inspiration, but it can hardly be said that we are even yet quite free from its effects, and every student of the Reformation period knows the force and persistence of appeals to Old Testament precedents during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, not only in Luther, Calvin, and Knox, but even in such a writer as Hooker.

As to the weight of Old Testament precedents and authority in the history of persecution there can surely be no reasonable doubt. The Old Testament abounds in instances of religious coercion, and in days when the Jewish theocracy was taken as a type of the relations between the Christian Church and the civil power, it was natural that appeal should be made to these precedents by men who did not perceive, or had forgotten, that our Lord's example and teaching had annulled all such arguments. So we find that coercion is justified by reference to the punishment of stoning prescribed for idolaters in Deuteronomy, to the fate of Dathan and Abiram, to the massacres of the Canaanites,

to the slaughter of the priests of Baal, and to the righteous zeal of Hezekiah, Josiah, and Nebuchadnezzar. Such arguments were freely employed by St. Augustine (cp. Appendix, Note A, p. 377), and were used from his time onwards for more than a thousand years. No writer applied them more unflinchingly than Melanchthon, who justified the execution of Servetus. Quite explicitly he denies the assertion that the Mosaic law is inapplicable—"Neque illa barbarica excusatio audienda est, leges illas pertinere ad politiam Mosaicam, non ad nostram. Ut Decalogus ipse ad omnes pertinet, ita judex ubique omnia Decalogi officia in externa disciplina tueatur"; and with equal clearness he cites the binding precedents of the kings of Judah. "Abusus missae per magistratus debet tolli. Non aliter atque sustulit aeneum Serpentem Ezechias, aut excelsa demolitus est Josias" (both passages quoted by Lord Acton, *History of Freedom*, pp. 167, 168). The appeal to the Old Testament on behalf of persecution was not obsolete even in the eighteenth century, for Bayle, in his *Commentaire philosophique sur les paroles "Contrains-les d'entrer,"* part ii. ch. iv., examines the objection that toleration cannot be approved without condemning the laws which God established among the Jews, and the action sometimes taken by the prophets. In the face of such evidence, which might be multiplied fifty-fold by any one who had the leisure to construct a *catena* of the opinions of ecclesiastical writers from the fifth century onwards, I am constrained to hold that Bishop Creighton was strangely mistaken in denying that persecution was largely due to a misunderstanding of the Scriptures, and especially of the Old Testament (*Persecution and Tolerance*, p. 3), though even he allowed that it was sometimes *defended* by such precedents (*ibid.* p. 76). On the other side, see Lecky, *Rationalism*, ii. pp. 12, 13, 25, and a passage to which he refers in Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, ch. xxiv. *ad fin.* "Le Christianisme a été intolérant; mais l'intolérance n'est pas un fait essentiellement chrétien. C'est un fait juif. . . . Le Pentateuque a de la sorte été dans le monde le premier code de la terreur religieuse."

NOTE E

See p. 164

Religious Intolerance as a Cause of Anti-Christian Feeling

In the French writers of the eighteenth century it is certainly possible to trace the effects of a revolt not only against superstition, but against religious intolerance and cruel persecution. It is strongly marked in Bayle, *e.g.* in his letter *La France toute catholique* prefixed to his *Commentaire philosophique sur les paroles "Contrains-les d'entrer."* Cp. p. 49 "Il y a longtems que votre Église n'a plus de Réputation à perdre, et qu'elle s'est couverte d'une infamie ineffaçable par ses deux *caractères indélibles* dont j'ai tant de fois parlé, *la Mauvaise-Foi* et *la Violence*." The same strain runs all through Bayle's *Commentaire*, and is found in the Encyclopaedists. In the case of Voltaire, it may be remembered how from the first he was stirred to indignation by instances of tyranny or persecution, and how great a part he played in the case of Calas. In his attacks on Christianity the hatred of persecution is always prominent, and no man contributed so much to the destruction of the theory and system of intolerance. The outbreak of furious anti-Christian hatred at the French Revolution, although it cannot be justified, may yet be in part explained as a blind reaction against religious tyranny (see lecture vi. p. 248, and cp. Lord Acton, *Lectures on the French Revolution*, p. 18). Since the Revolution, the spread of toleration has brought about a state of things in which there is less occasion for actual protest against religious tyranny; but in Agnostic or anti-Christian thought, both English and Continental, we may often see the traditional strain of indignation against intolerance, and the tacit or expressed assumption that Christianity as an organised system, if not as an individual creed, must ever be the ally of privilege and tyranny, and the enemy of liberty. It requires more knowledge of the modern literature of Free Thought than the present writer possesses to trace this in full detail, but it would be possible to find many illustrations of the tendency in

the works of English writers during the last century and at the present time, *e.g.* J. S. Mill, *On Liberty*; Lord Morley, *On Compromise*, and his *Voltaire* and *Diderot*; Sir Leslie Stephen, *An Agnostic's Apology*; J. M. Robertson, *Short History of Free Thought*; G. Lowes Dickinson, *Religion, a Criticism and a Forecast* (esp. ch. 1). It would be wrong to class Mr. Lecky with anti-Christian writers, but his great work on *Rationalism*, to which reference has so frequently been made, is one of the severest indictments of the policy of the Church in departing from the principles of Christ, and his sense of the evils of that policy seems to have alienated him in some measure from official and organised Christianity, while he retained his admiration for its true moral ideals. Cp. *Rationalism* (ii. 249) and *Memoir of W. E. H. Lecky*, p. 421.

LECTURE V

NOTE A

See p. 190

Papalist and Imperialist Claims in the Fourteenth Century

The *Defensor Pacis* of Marsilius of Padua was written in 1324 in defence of Lewis of Bavaria against John the Twenty-second. The *Summa de Potestate Ecclesiastica* of Augustinus Triumphus of Ancona probably dates from between 1324 and his death in 1328. William of Ockham and Alvarus Pelagius (Alvaro Pelayo), a Spaniard, wrote in the next decade. Alvarus Pelagius began his *De Planctu Ecclesiae* in 1330; the second revision appears to be as late as 1340 (Gierke-Maitland, *Political Theories*, Introduction, p. lxviii). Not having space or leisure to examine more than one of the champions on each side in the controversy, I have taken Alvarus as the representative of the Papal claims and Marsilius of the Imperial; but I do not think that the result of the comparison would have been materially different if Augustinus Triumphus had been selected in the place of Alvarus, and William of Ockham in the place of Marsilius. Dr. R. L. Poole, in his *Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Political Thought*, chs. viii. and ix., gives an interesting account of the views of Augustinus and William of Ockham, and indeed of the whole controversy. Cp. also Figgis, *Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius*, introductory lecture, pp. 17, 18, 28. I have referred frequently in the fifth and sixth lectures to this illuminating book on an obscure subject; I am under great obligations to it and to its author. Gierke's *Political*

Theories of the Middle Ages, translated by the late Professor Maitland, also contains numerous references to the works of the principal disputants in the controversy.

The edition of Alvarus Pelagius, *De Planctu Ecclesiae*, to which reference is made in the notes to this lecture, is that contained in Rocaberti's *Bibliotheca Maxima Pontificia*, vol. iii. (Rome, 1698).

LECTURE VI

NOTE A

See p. 225

The Doctrine of an Invisible Church

Luther did not go so far as Calvin or Zwingli in substituting an Invisible Church for the traditional belief in the Visible Church. Indeed some passages in his writings emphasise the reality of the Visible Church, but it is hardly possible to reconcile his different utterances on the subject, or to formulate any consistent doctrine. The doctrine of the Visible Church was preserved in the Confession of Augsburg of 1531 (Art. vii.), and the Saxon Confession of 1551 (Art. xii.), and is more explicitly maintained in Article xix. of the Church of England (cp. also Art. xxvi.). On the other hand Calvin's view was influenced by his doctrine of predestination, and he distinguishes two senses of the word "Church" in Scripture, giving prominence to the Invisible Church (*Institutio*, iv. i. 7). Zwingli went further still, and accounted the invisible communion of the elect to be the true Church of the Creed. This development of view is reflected in several of the Protestant Confessions, *e.g.* the *Second Helvetic Confession* (1552), the *Scottish Confession of Faith* (1560), and, in a rather slighter degree, in the *Westminster Confession* (1643). An extreme form of the belief may be found in a passage of Hooper's *Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith*, quoted by Bishop Gibson, *Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 499: "I believe and confess one only Catholic and Universal Church, which is an holy congregation of all faithful believers, which are chosen and predestinate unto

everlasting life before the foundations of the world were laid. . . . I believe that this Church is invisible to the eye of man, and is only to God known; . . . For as touching the visible Church, which is the congregation of the good and of the wicked, of the chosen and of the reprobate, and generally of all those which say they believe in Christ, I do not believe that to be the Church, because that Church is seen of the eye, and the faith thereof is in visible things" (*Later Writings of Bishop Hooper*, Parker Society ed., p. 40).

There is a useful collection of passages from the Reformers in Dr. Darwell Stone's *The Christian Church*, ch. xv., and he also gives examples of later Presbyterian and Nonconformist views on the subject. I have borrowed freely from his references, and from Bishop Gibson's comments and references on Article XIX. Much material may also be found in R. Seeberg's *Der Begriff der Christlichen Kirche* (Erlangen, 1885), in which references are given to Christian writings from the *Shepherd* of Hermas down to the works of Albert Ritschl.

The distinction between the Protestant conception of an Invisible Church and the patristic conception of One Church with true and false members is pointed out by Bishop Gore, *Church and Ministry*, ch. i. p. 19, note: "Whereas the members of the 'Invisible Church' are regarded as belonging indifferently to any or no ecclesiastical unity, with Origen and Augustin the conception is the opposite. The membership in the 'true Church' depends upon membership in the one visible Church on earth. The true Church is a subdivision of the actual Church—its genuine members." At the same time it is also true that St. Augustine did not wholly succeed in reconciling his theory of the visible Church with his doctrine of grace, and the germ of the idea of an invisible Church may perhaps be traced back to him (Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 187.)

That the intention of Christ was to found a visible society, and that His intention was rightly interpreted in the Apostolic and the Ante-Nicene period, has been maintained in lectures i. and ii.

The doctrine of an Invisible Church has found no more powerful assailant than William Law, who attacked Bishop

Hoadly's celebrated sermon with merciless logic and sarcasm. ("Third Letter to the Bishop of Bangor," in reprint of *Collected Works of William Law*, 1892, vol. i. p. 89.) In his later years, however, Law's mystical tendencies seem to have led him to accept the principle of an Invisible Church: see Letter I. (*Collected Works*, ix. 109).

NOTE B

See p. 241

Lord Acton's Comparison of Catholic and Protestant Intolerance

Lord Acton in his essay on "The Protestant Theory of Persecution" (*History of Freedom*, pp. 150-187) draws a sharp contrast between the principles which underlay Catholic and Protestant persecutions respectively.

His contention is that "Protestant persecution was based on a purely speculative foundation, and was due partly to the influence of scriptural examples, partly to the supposed interests of the Protestant party." The Protestants thought it right to suppress theological error, whereas Catholic intolerance had been based on two ideas — "the criminality of apostasy, and the inability of the State to maintain its authority where the moral sense of a part of the community was in opposition to it" (p. 165).

Again he writes, pp. 169-170: "Catholic intolerance is handed down from an age when unity subsisted, and when its preservation, being essential for that of society, became a necessity of State as well as a result of circumstances. Protestant intolerance, on the contrary, was the peculiar result of a dogmatic system in contradiction with the facts and principles on which the intolerance actually existing among Catholics was founded. . . . The only instance in which the Protestant theory has been adopted by Catholics is the revocation of the Edict of Nantes."

Again, pp. 186-187: "There is nothing in common between Catholic and Protestant intolerance. The Church began with the principle of liberty, both as her claim and as her rule; and

external circumstances forced intolerance upon her, after her spirit of unity had triumphed, in spite both of the freedom she proclaimed and of the persecutions she suffered. Protestantism set up intolerance as an imperative precept and as part of its doctrine, and was forced to admit toleration by the necessities of its position."

Lord Acton's view that Protestantism thought it right to persecute and suppress theological error appears to be well grounded; but the sharp contrast which he draws between this principle and the principle which underlay the persecuting policy of the pre-Reformation Church is, I believe, greatly exaggerated, if not wholly imaginary. The desire to extirpate theological error seems to be as strongly marked in St. Augustine or Charlemagne, or Cardinal Ximenes or Ferdinand and Isabella, as in Calvin or Melanchthon; nor were Catholic persecutors less liable to be misled by Old Testament precedents, or by the perversion of New Testament precepts, than the Reformers of the sixteenth century. Mr. Benjamin Kidd (*Principles of Western Civilisation*, p. 246) quotes with approval a remark of the late Professor D. G. Ritchie, in his book on *Natural Rights*, that "persecution in the sense of repression for the purposes of maintaining true doctrine is the outcome of Christianity." He guards himself against asserting that persecution is involved in the *true* interpretation of Christianity, but he does not appear to make any distinction between Catholic and Protestant in this respect.

See lecture iv. pp. 160-163, and the notes A, C, D in the Appendix to that lecture; and cp. Lecky, *Rationalism*, i. ch. iv., for the doctrine of exclusive salvation and its effects upon persecution.

NOTE C

See p. 249

The Use of the Term "Erastianism"

I have used the word "Erastianism" in these lectures in the sense in which it has gained general currency, especially in

England—*i.e.* to denote the school of thought which denies the independence of the spiritual power and justifies the intervention of the "Magistrate," or civil power, in matters of religion. It is plain that there may be many different degrees of "Erastianism" in this sense of the word, and not only men like Hobbes, Selden, and Hoadly, but also such a writer as Hooker, might be rightly described as "Erastian."

It may well be disputed whether "Erastianism" is the best term to apply to this tendency, and it has been proposed to substitute "Byzantinism" as more appropriate. This suggestion was made some fifty years ago by Archdeacon Hardwick in his *Church History, Reformation Period*, p. 328 (ed. by Bishop Stubbs), and has been revived independently by Dr. Figgis in the interesting article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1900, pp. 66 f., in which he discusses at length the question whether Erastus was an Erastian. He points out the limitations of the contention put forward by Erastus. Erastus, who was a Zwinglian, was engaged in a long struggle against "ruling elders" and the power of excommunication; and his posthumously published work was entitled *Explicatio gravissima quaestionis gravissimae utrum Excommunicatio mandato nitatur divino an excogitata sit ab hominibus.* "Erastus was solely concerned with the question as to the proper method and authority for enforcing ecclesiastical discipline in a state which was uniform in its religion. He was not concerned with the question as to the right to proclaim truth, or as to the coercive religious authority of a State which allowed more than one, or persecuted the true, faith." This is quite plain from Erastus' own words, *Explicatio*, p. 162 (book iii. ch. i. of the *Confirmatio*). "Summa est, Magistratum in Christiana Republica unicum esse cui a Deo commissa sit gubernatio externa rerum omnium, quae vel ad civilem vel ad piam et Christianam vitam pertinent; jus et autoritatem imperandi ac jus dicendi neque ministris neque aliis ullis concessum esse. Intelligi hoc debet de ea Republica dictum in qua magistratus et subditi eandem profitentur religionem eamque veram. In hac dico duas distinctas jurisdictiones minime debere esse. In alia, in qua videlicet Magistratus falsam tuetur sententiam, certo quodam modo tolerabilis videri fortasse possit divisio

rectionum." Erastus was largely influenced by Old Testament precedents — "non video cur hodie non debeat Magistratus Christianus idem facere quod in Republica Judaeorum facere a Deo jussus est" (Deut. iv., Joshua i.). Not Aaron, but Moses, he remarks, exercised the coercive power (*Explicatio*, Thesis 73).

The term "Erastianism" was naturalised in England in the debates of the Westminster Assembly, and it is to the controversies of that time that Dr. Figgis traces the extension of "Erastianism" to denote, not opposition to excommunication, but the defence of the view that the magistrate could order religion as he liked, and enforce obedience.

Erastus, therefore, it may be justly acknowledged, was less "Erastian" than many who are supposed to owe their views to his influence—"he was, I believe, less Erastian than Whitgift, perhaps less so than Cranmer, far less so than Selden and Hobbes" (Figgis, p. 95). It is, indeed, to Hobbes' *Leviathan* and Selden's *Table Talk* that we should turn if we wish to see the full development of English "Erastianism." Yet, although we must remember the limitations of Erastus' contentions, the jealousy which he shows of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the stress which he lays upon the power of "the magistrate," reveal where his sympathies lay. In the words of M. Bonnard, who has made a careful study of his life and writings, "Éraste y énonce certains principes d'une portée générale dont la présence justifie l'emploi qui a été fait plus tard de son nom" (*Thomas Éraste et la discipline ecclésiastique*, Lausanne, 1894).

(Some account of Erastus, and of Wolfgang Musculus, by whom he was greatly influenced, is given in Fremantle's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 189-192.)

LECTURE VII

NOTE A

See p. 282

The Interpretation of the Parable of the Tares (St. Matthew xiii. 24-30, 36-43)

The true interpretation of the Parable of the Tares, and its application to the policy of the Church in the matter of discipline, are questions which were keenly discussed in the controversy between St. Augustine and the African Donatists. The Donatists, in their zeal for the purity of the Church, wished to limit membership in the visible Church to those who were actually holy. St. Augustine, on the other hand, drew a distinction between the *communio sanctorum* and the *communio externa*, holding that the visible Church contained both good and bad, and that of those who were predestined to life some were outside and some inside the visible Church (Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, p. 195). The Parables of the Tares and of the Draw-Net seemed to supply him with an argument of which he was not slow to avail himself, and he charged the Donatists with the error of wishing to root out the tares before the harvest. The answer of the Donatists was that, according to our Lord's own explanation, "the field" was not the Church but "the World" (ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος); and that therefore the parable proved nothing with regard to the point at issue. The authority of St. Augustine—"*quem contradicere fas non est*"[1]—has been so great in the Church that it has apparently been

[1] Dr. R. L. Poole (*Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Thought*, p. 49) quotes these words from Paschasius Radbert, *De partu Virginis*, ii., and remarks that among scholars of the time of Claudius of Turin and Agobard Augustine ranked second alone to the Bible.

assumed almost universally that his interpretation must have been the right one. But is the question, after all, so easily decided, and ought the Donatist interpretation to be put out of court without a hearing?

Some commentators seem to think that, if "the field" is not to be interpreted as "the Church," the parable has little or no meaning; so Archbishop Trench writes, "It required no special teaching to acquaint the disciples that *in the world* there would ever be a mixture of good and bad." It is true that if "the field" = "the world," the parable ceases to have a direct bearing on Church discipline; but it may convey a different lesson, viz. that the Church must not be expected to become co-extensive with the world, and that it must not use violent or premature means of uprooting evil. This surely is a lesson which the Church has often forgotten.

If St. Augustine's interpretation is the true one, it is at least remarkable that our Lord should have explained the field as ὁ κόσμος, and we must suppose that κόσμος is used in its geographical sense as the sphere of the Church's operations, and that the reference to the Church is fixed by the fact that the parable is announced at the outset to be concerning the kingdom of Heaven, *i.e.* the Church. I do not venture to assert that this interpretation is impossible, but I venture to think that it is extremely uncertain, and that it is a very unsafe basis on which to build a great practical argument. I find that Dr. Plummer, the most recent commentator on St. Matthew, writes, in his *Exegetical Commentary*, p. 193, "The field is the world, not the Church, which gives too narrow a meaning to the parable, and leaves out of account the multitudes of good and bad who are not Christians."

Of course the rejection of St. Augustine's view would in no way prove that the Donatist view of Church discipline was free from exaggeration; it would simply prove that one of St. Augustine's arguments against it was not really applicable.

On the other hand, even if it is right to interpret "the field" as = the Church, the parable need not be taken to teach acquiescence in a low standard of discipline, but only to show that the power of full discernment between holy and unholy belongs to God

alone, and that any wholesale attempt altogether to exclude imperfect members is doomed to failure. William Law, who applied the parable to the doctrine of a visible Church, was most keenly alive to the evils of promiscuous and nominal Christianity.

A full account of St. Augustine's view will be found in Archbishop Trench's *Notes on the Parables*, pp. 87 f. (14th edition). He strongly upholds Augustine's interpretation, and quotes Calvin on the same side. The chief references to St. Augustine's writings will be found in Trench's notes. Cp. also Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 185.

INDEX

Abbott, Dr. E. A., 346-347
Accommodation, policy of, 116
Aconcio, 243-244
Acton, Lord, references to his *History of Freedom* or other writings, 159, 160, 221-230, 372, 384, 391-392
Acts of the Apostles, authorship, 8; the Church as represented in, 24-26
Adelbert, 137, 379
Adeney, Dr. W. F., 180, 203, 298
Africa, the Church in, 122, 136, 137
Agnosticism, 279
Aidan, St., 137, 142-143
Alaric, 135
Albigenses, the, 205
Alcuin, 145, 149
Alexander VI., 201
Alexandria, the Church of, 102, 112, 172
Alfred the Great, 157
Allard, M., 40, 50, 57-59, 63-64, 99-101, 363-364
Allen, Cardinal, 250, 253, 255
Althusius, 252
Alvarus Pelagius, 183, 190-192, 387-388
Ambrose, St., 101-103, 373
America, evangelisation of, 380. *See also* United States.
Ammianus Marcellinus, 99
Anabaptists, 222, 242
Anagni, 206
Anglo-Saxon tendencies in religion, 260
Ansgar, 137
Anthropomorphism, 155
Anti-Christian thought, 156, 164, 385-386
Anti-clerical legislation in England, 207
Antioch, the Church of, 26, 118, 172
Anti-papal legislation in England, 207
Apocalypse, date of, 8, 33, 48, 357-359; situation described in, 8, 32-34, 48, 205, 357-359
Apocryphal Gospels, 21
Apologists, the, 50, 55, 64, 367
Apostasy, 59, 67, 115, 143-144, 146, 152, 162
Apostles, training of the, 18
Apostolic age, the Church in the, 15-30; apostolic authority, 28, 30
Appeals, system of, 193, 207, 233, 234
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 162
Arcadius, 104-105
Arianism, 98, 102, 135-136, 140, 173, 181
Aristotle, 193, 253
Arno, Archbishop of Salzburg, 149
Arnold of Brescia, 200, 205, 220
Arnold, C. F., 40, 47
Articles, the XXXIX., 236, 246, 314, 390
Asceticism, 68-69, 74, 120-122
Asia, the Churches of, 358; the province of, 33
Association, laws as to, 55
Athanasius, St., 101-102, 173
Atheism, Christians accused of, 55
Atheists excluded from toleration, 246
Athenagoras, 64
Athens, closing of the schools at, 106
Attila, 180

Augsburg, Confession of, 225, 389; peace of, 225, 234
Augustine, St. (of Canterbury), 142-143
Augustine, St. (of Hippo), 115, 117, 119-122, 131-133, 138, 145, 161, 247, 366, 373-374, 377-378, 384, 390, 392, 395-397
Augustinus Triumphus, 183, 190, 196, 387
Augustus, the Emperor, 44
Aurelian, 72
Aurelius, M., 57-58
Ausonius, 119-120
Australia, reunion in, 315
Authority, decay of, 301
Avignon, the Papal Court at, 206-207
ἅγιοι. *See* Saints.
ἀδελφοί, ἀδελφότης. *See* Brotherhood.
αἰών, 353

Babylon, Papal Rome identified with, 205
Balfour of Burleigh, Lord, 239
Banister v. *Thompson*, 293
Baptism, Infant, 66-67; compulsory or wholesale, 106, 112-113, 138-141, 378-381; as a condition of citizenship, 197; indiscriminate administration of, in England, 274
Barbados, establishment retained in, 299
Barbarians, invasions of the, 130, 134; their attitude to the Empire, 135, 186; attitude to Christianity, 135; Arianism prevalent among them, 135; methods used for their conversion, 138-152
Bartlet, J. Vernon, 66, 365
Bayle, Pierre, 138, 157, 242, 247-248, 377, 384-385
Becket, Thomas, 202
Bede, the Venerable, 140, 143-144, 150, 153
Benedict IX., 200
Bernard, Dr. J. H., 144
Bernard, St., 192, 381-382
Beugnot, A., on the destruction of paganism in the West, 93-95, 107, 115, 117-118, 375
Beza, 230, 242
Biblical Criticism, effects of, 301
Bickersteth, Bishop Edward, 314
Bigg, Dr. C., 31, 57, 313, 361, 368
Birkbeck, W. J., 298
Bishoprics' Bills, delay in passing them through Parliament, 291
Bishops, objects of persecution, 59-60; growth of their powers, 72-73; civil powers conferred upon, 106; their influence, 158
Blasphemy laws, 247
Bluntschli, J. K., 4
Boccaccio, 200
Bodley, J. E. C., on modern France, 297, 328
Boissier, M. Gaston, on paganism, 13, 42, 87, 91, 97-102, 132, 361, 363-364
Boniface, St., 137, 144-145
Boniface VIII., 189, 192, 196, 198, 205-206, 210
Bonomelli, Mons., on the Church in Italy, 297, 337
Booth, Charles, 275, 287
Borgia, the family of, 200
Bossuet, 240, 242-243
Bribery of converts, 114
Bright, Dr. W., 139, 144, 157, 356
Britain, conversion of, 142-143
Brotherhood of believers, 28, 71, 354
Browne, Robert, 254
Browning, Robert, 151, 209
Brunichildis, 114, 140
Bryce, J. (*Holy Roman Empire*), 135, 140, 179, 185-189, 212-213, 217, 224, 233
Bucer, 227, 231
Bullinger, 232
Bulls, Papal, *Unam Sanctam*, 189; *Ausculta Fili*, 210-211
Burckhardt, J., 87, 94
Burial service, use of the, 274
Burkitt, Dr. F. C., 9, 351
Bury, Professor, 106, 129, 135, 144, 186, 203, 369, 371
Butler, Bishop, 14, 258
Byzantine. *See* Constantinople, Empire, Eastern.
Byzantinism, 393

Cæsars, worship of the, 12, 33, 55-56, 78, 358-361
Caligula, 45
Callistus, 181
Calvin, John, 219, 228-232, 237, 389, 392
Cannibalism, Christians accused of, 54
Canon Law, 182
Canons of 1604, 235, 236
Canossa, 188-189
Capitularies, 154, 157-158, 188
Cartwright, Thomas, 250, 253, 255
Casas, Las, 380
Castellio, 230, 241-243
Catholic theory of persecution, 160, 391-392
Catholicity of the Church, 25, 59, 70, 79, 365-367
Cavour, 337
Celestine V., 198, 205
Celibacy, clerical, 69, 121
Celsus, 58, 367
Chaos, the religious, of to-day, 267-302
Charles the Bald, 184
Charles the Great (Charlemagne), 110, 144-146, 186-188, 192, 218, 321, 392
Charles V., 241
Chastel, E., on the destruction of paganism in the East, 62, 95, 100, 104-105, 107, 113, 371, 375
Chaucer, 201-202
Christ, His intention for the Church, 15-24; His method, 18, 21-22; His training of the disciples, 18; He leaves no detailed code or constitution, 23; nature of His Kingdom, 163, 311; need of returning to His principles, 164, 213, 311
"Christian," the name. *See* Χριστιανοί.
Christianity, prevalence of nominal, 4, 111 f., 152 f., 273 f.; not merely an individual religion, 20, 25; cosmopolitan, 25-27; misunderstood by pagans, 30, 54; persecuted by Jews, 30-31, 47; by Roman government, 31-34, 46-60; its universal mission, 10, 348-350; differentiated from Judaism, 47; becomes hereditary, 66-67; geographical extension of at end of third century, 75-76; causes of its victory, 77-79, 368-370; protected and favoured by Constantine and his successors, 92-108; its absorption of Greco-Roman paganism, 111 f.; of the barbarians, 137 f.
Christians, number of, about A.D. 300, 61, 76; names applied to Christians in the Early Church, 354-355; Christians regarded as a *tertium genus*, 54; crimes imputed to them, 54-56; their attitude to society, 52-55
Chrysostom, St. John, 118-119, 373
Church, the Christian: in the Gospels, 16-19, 23-24; in the Acts and the Epistles, 25-30, 356-357; not an afterthought, 25; local Churches and the Universal Church, 27-30, 355-357; unity of the Church, 30, 71, 73-74, 172, 208, 357; organisation of, 70-71; a visible society, 15, 18-20, 25; theory of an Invisible Church, 225, 260, 389-390; Christians persecuted as members of a Church, 41, 369; Apostolic Church, 25-30; Ante-Nicene Church, characteristics of, 64 f.; secularisation of, 111-120; alliance with the world, 109-111, 123-125
Church, the Eastern, 180, 203-204, 297-298, 317
Church, the Jewish, 11
Church of England, at the Reformation, 232-237; in the eighteenth century, 256-258; relation to the Crown, 233-235; present position of, 273 f.; relations to Parliament, 291 f.; statistics, 295; qualified to mediate between other religious bodies, 318. *See also* Establishment.
Church of England Men's Society, 324
Church of Scotland (Established), 237-239, 316
Church Reform League, 334

Church, Dean, 20, 135, 140, 158, 173, 195, 311
Civil power. *See* State.
Civilisation, services of Christianity to, 123, 158, 208
Classes from which converts were drawn in the Early Church, 75, 367-368
Claudius (Emperor), 43, 45
Clement of Alexandria, 363, 366
Clement V., 206
Clergy, separation of, 69, 121, 202; privileges of, 94, 202
Clericalism, 333-335
Clovis, 137, 139-140, 186
Coercion. *See* Persecution.
Coit, Dr. Stanton, 280
Columbanus, 137
Communicants, paucity of, 276-277
Communion, the right to repel from, 293-294
Conciliar movement, 207-208
Confession of Augsburg, 219, 389; other Protestant confessions, 389
Confirmation, neglect of, 276
Congregationalism, 254, 260
Constans, 96-97
Constantine the Great, his conversion, character, aims, religious policy, 60, 77, 85-96, 185, 213, 242
Constantine VI., 186
Constantinople, foundation of, 96; its results, 178-179; religion at, 118-119; see of, 172, 177, 179; fall of, 204
Constantius (father of Constantine), 90
Constantius (son of Constantine), 96-97
Contract between Church and State, theory of, 255-256
Convocations, the, 236, 258, 291
Conybeare, F. C., 40, 52-53
Corinth, Church of, 28
Corporate religion, 20; Christianity essentially corporate, 283, 369
Corruption of mediaeval Church, 197-202
Cosmopolitanism of the Church, 25, 27, 79, 270, 333
Coulton, G. G., 209
Councils, Ante-Nicene, 58, 71; character of councils in fourth century, 176; Council (Synod) of Antioch, 171; Basel, 207; Chalcedon, 172, 177; Clovesho, 143, 154; Constance, 207; Constantinople (381), 176; Elvira, 53, 79; Ephesus, 118, 176; Ferrara, 207; Florence, 203-204, 207; Lateran (1139), 200; "Latrocinium," 176; Lestines, 143, 154; Lyons, 203-204; Nicaea, 38; Pisa, 207; Ratisbon, 143; Rheims, 115; Sardica, 181-182; Trent, 219; *in Trullo*, 74; Vatican, 183
Counter-Reformation, the, 240, 259
Crabbe, George, 258
Creighton, Bishop, 159, 161-162, 170, 244, 336, 372, 384
Criticism. *See* Biblical Criticism, New Testament.
Cromwell, Oliver, 244-245
Crusades, 147
Cumont, F., on Oriental religions, 78
Cyprian, St., 58-60, 62, 73-75
Cyril of Alexandria, 176-177, 382
Cyril of Jerusalem, 366
Cyril (apostle of the Slavs), 137
Cyrus, 113
Χριστιανοί, 355

Dante (*Divina Commedia*), 179, 198-199; (*De Monarchia*), 194-196
Dark Ages, 129, 153
Davies, Dr. J. Llewelyn, 290, 334
Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage Act (1907), 293
Decius, persecution of, 58, 62, 67, 73
Decretals, the Forged, 182-183
Decretum of Gratian, 183
Dickinson, G. Lowes, 386
"Diffusive" influence of Christianity, 123-124, 269, 283-284, 324
Diggle, Dr. J. W. (Bishop of Carlisle), 290
Dill, Sir S., 120
Dio Cassius, 43, 45
Diocletian, persecution of, 60-62, 67; his division of the empire, 185
Diognetus, Epistle to, 13, 80-81

Disciples, discipleship: in the New Test., 17, 28, 278-279; not a temporary phase, 310; need of reviving its obligations, 319-326
Discipline, in New Test., 28-29; in Early Church, 68-69, 74-79; decay of, 119; modern dislike of, 272-278; need of reviving, 319-320
Disestablishment, in Colonies, 298; in England, 326-331; piecemeal disestablishment, 327; in France, 297, 327-328; in Ireland, 327
Disloyalty, Christians accused of, 48, 55
Disraeli, B. (Earl of Beaconsfield), 292
Dissent, in England, 243, 295, 315-316
Diversity, growth of religious, 243, 269-272, 295, 312-319; unity in, 313
Divine right of kings, 226
Divorce, 272
Dodwell, Henry (the elder), 61
Döllinger, Dr. I. von, 150, 372-373, 378
Domitian, 33, 45, 47, 358-359
Donatism, 74, 79, 122, 132, 366, 377, 395-397
Draw Net, parable of the, 395
Druidism, 43
Dualism, of Church and world, 34, 336
Duchesne, Mgr. L., 58-59, 116, 179, 315
Dudden, Dr. F. H., 114-116, 180, 183-184, 211

Ecce Homo, 19, 23
Ecebolius, 100
Eclecticism in religion, 271
Education, religious, 285, 331-332
Edward VI., 234-235
Eighteenth century, religion in, 257-258
Einhard, 146
Elizabeth, Reformation in reign of, 234-236, 253
Elliot, Hon. A., 290
Emperors, Roman. *See* under individual Emperors.
Emperors, worship of. *See* Caesars, worship of the.
Empire, ancient Roman: its general attitude to foreign religions, 42-43; treatment of Judaism, 43-46; of Christianity, 46-60; Christian attitude towards, 64; new policy begins with Constantine, 92 f.; rupture with paganism, 95 f.; close connection with Christian Church, 104-106; control of emperors over the Church, 173-175; relations with the barbarians, 134-135; fall of Western Empire, 179, 186; Eastern emperors have little power in the West, 179, 186
Empire, mediaeval: coronation of Charles the Great, 187; struggles with the Papacy, 188-190; imperialist claims in fourteenth century, 192-194; effect of Reformation upon the Empire, 224
England, conversion of, 142-143. *See also* Church of England
"Enthusiasm," 257
Episcopate. *See* Bishops.
Erasmus, 221
Erastianism, Erastians, 180, 203, 225, 249-253, 257, 260, 294-295, 297-298, 329, 337, 392-394
Erastus, 252, 393-394
Eschatological theory, 16, 350-352, 364
Establishment, nature of, 289; advantages and disadvantages of, 256, 288-295, 329-330; in Scotland, 239, 289; in India, 298-299; impossible in new countries, 298, 328; difficulty of preserving it, 326, 331; a relic of different conditions, 328; no longer logical, 329. *See also* Disestablishment, Erastianism, State.
Ethelbert, 114, 152
Eusebius of Caesarea, 51, 55, 59, 60, 64, 72-73, 86-96, 115, 362-363
Eutropius, 94
Exclusive salvation, doctrine of, 161-162, 377-378
Excommunication, 222

Extensive policy of the Church, 110, 138 f., 171 f., 301, 321
ἐκκλησία, use of the word in the New Testament, 16-17, 27-30, 355-357. *See also* Church.

Fairbairn, Dr. A. M., 220, 229
Faith, ages of, 209
Family life, Christianity in relation to, 52
Fatalism, 159
Fatherhood of God, 16
Faustus, 117
Fear as a motive in religion, 155, 337
Figgis, Dr. J. Neville, 193-194, 196-197, 208, 222-226, 240, 248, 252, 254-256, 279, 387, 392-394
Filioque clause, 203-204
Finance, Church, 278
Firmicus Maternus, 97, 373
Flagellants, 205
Fleury, C., 86
Fowler, W. Warde, 116
Fox, George, 254
France, present position of Catholicism in, 296-297; repeal of the Concordat, 328
Francis of Assisi, St., 200
Franks, the, 137, 139, 140
Fraticelli (or Spiritual Franciscans), 205
Fredegund, 140
Frederick Barbarossa, 189
"Free Church in a Free State," 336-337
Freedom, a principle of the divine method, 13-14, 307-308
Fremantle, Dr. W. H. (Dean of Ripon), 208, 237, 258, 329-330
Frere, W. H., 238, 315
Friends, Society of, 254

Gairdner, Dr. J., 235
Galerius, persecution of, 60
Gallicanism, 240
Gallienus, 60
Gardner, Professor P., 13
Gascoyne-Cecil, Lord W., 318
Gaul, persecution in, 57; state of morality, 140; Jews in, 114; paganism in, 107
Gebhardt, O. von, 40, 51, 55
Gefficken, Dr., 223 f., 228, 231, 238
Gelasian Sacramentary, 341
Gelasius (Pope), 115
Gentiles, 12; Gentile converts, 24, 30
George II., 257-258
Germany, Reformation in, 219-227; Erastianism in, 260
Ghibellines, 189
Gibbon, Edward, 61, 77, 139, 185, 203, 368-369
Gibson, Dr. (Bishop of Gloucester), 236, 389-390
Gierke, Dr., 194, 208, 252, 387-388
Gieseler, J. K. L., 179, 183, 190, 205-206, 211
Gladstone, W. E., 123, 292
Glover, T. R., 13, 42, 368
Gnostics, 74, 81
"Godly prince," the, 225, 234, 236, 249
Gore, Dr. (Bishop of Birmingham), 17, 69, 178, 181, 183, 239, 273, 301, 351, 356, 390
Gospels, date and authorship of the, 8, 345; evidence of, about the Church, 16-24
Goths, 135-136
Gower, John, 201-202
Gratian (Emperor), 102, 374
Greece, religion of, 12, 16, 98; paganism lingers in, 107
Gregory the Great, 113-114, 116, 142-143, 180-183, 208, 211
Gregory III., 145
Gregory V., 189
Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), 181, 188-189, 192, 208
Gregory of Tours, 139-140
Gregory Nazianzen, 99, 101, 102, 176
Grosseteste, Bishop, 204, 208
Grotius, 252
Guelfs, 188
Guizot, M., 208

Hadrian (Emperor), 51, 57
Hadrian I. (Pope), 184
Hadrian II., 189
Hadrian V., 198
Hallam, H., 241, 244

Hampton Court Conference, 238
Hardwick, Archdeacon, 132, 145-153 (notes, *passim*), 379, 381, 393
Hardy, Dr. E. G., 26, 40, 42-57
Harnack, Dr., 8, 10, 39-81 (notes, *passim*), 88, 212, 346, 347-349, 355, 362, 368-369, 371-372, 375
Hatch, Dr. E., 69, 72, 121, 397
Headlam, Dr. A. C., 345-347
Hefele, Bishop, 58, 171-172, 177, 182
Heiden, derivation of, 372
Helena, 90
Henderson, B. W., 40, 48, 64, 358, 368
Henoticon, 174
Henry VIII., 194, 232-236
Henson, H. Hensley, 26, 28, 274-276, 290
Hereditary Christianity, 66
Heresy, heretics: heretics in Ante-Nicene Church, 74; coercion of, by imperial power, 104, 106, 110; by the reformers, 227, 229, 240-241, 377-378, 384. *See also* Persecution.
Hilary of Poitiers, 373
Hincmar, 183, 184
Hippolytus, Canons of, 53-54
Hoadly, Bishop, 391, 393
Hobbes, Thomas, 251, 394
Hodgkin, Dr. T., 134, 139, 146, 152, 153, 185, 187, 254
Holland, religion in, 260
Holland, Spencer L., 232
Honorius (Emperor), 105
Honorius I. (Pope), 181
Hooker, Richard, 210, 223, 232, 249-250, 253, 255, 393
Hooper, Bishop, 390
Hort, Dr., 17, 19, 29, 349-350, 356-358
Hunnerich, 136, 137
Huss, John, 220
Hutton, W. H., 245
Hypatia, 107
Hypocrisy, 115, 149

Iconoclasm, 155, 203
"Idea" of the Church, 6, 15-24
Ignatius of Antioch, 72-73, 365
Immorality, 119-120, 140, 155-156, 200-202, 206
Immortality, development of belief in, 15
Independence of the spiritual power, 253-256
Independents, 254
India, missions in, 298, 322, 381; Establishment in, 322
Indifference, religious, 280-281
Individualism in religion, 20, 153, 160, 259-260
Infallibility of the Church, 308; of the Pope, 181, 191-192
Innes, A. Taylor, 72-73, 238-239, 245, 252, 338
Innocent I., 180-181
Innocent III., 181, 189, 192
Innocent IV., 189
Inquisition, in Spain, 152, 240; elsewhere, 205
Inspiration of New Testament, 8
Interdenominational methods, 316
Intolerance. *See* Persecution.
Investitures, 188
Ireland, conversion of, 144
Irenaeus, 178
Isis, worship of, 43
Italy, paganism in, 114; Papal sovereignty in, 183; Catholicism in modern Italy, 297; Church and State in, 337

James I., 238
Japan, the Church of (Nippon Sei Kōkwai), 314
Jerome, St., 100, 117-120
Jerusalem, destruction of, 45, 365
Jesuits, 255-256
Jewel, Bishop, 235-236
Jews, Judaism: Jewish Church, 11, 269; Judaism and Christianity, 25-27, 30; Judaism tolerated by Rome, 41-46; diffusion of, 44; antipathy felt against it, 44
Johannine writings, 8, 22, 352-354, 357-359
John, St. (Apostle), 8, 33-34, 38
John of Salisbury, 211
John X. (Pope), 201
John XI. (Pope), 201
John XII. (Pope), 188
John XXII. (Pope), 190 f.

Josephus, Flavius, 45
Jovian, 101
Julian, 78, 97-100, 117
Julius Caesar, 44
Jurieu, 242
Justification by faith, 218, 221
Justin I. (Emperor), 105
Justin Martyr, 55, 63
Justinian, religious policy and legislation, 105-107, 112, 129, 197

Keble, John, 264, 304
Kingdom of God (or of Heaven), 11, 18, 25
Knightly Orders, evangelisation by, 144, 146-147
Knox, John, 237-238
κόσμος, use of the word in New Testament, 22, 352-353. *See also* World.

Lactantius, 60, 90, 373
Laity, separation from clergy, 121, 202; true position of, 334-335
Lambeth Conferences: fourth, 314, 317; fifth, 315, 317
Lang, Dr. (Archbishop of York), 275, 323, 324
à Lasco, John, 232
Latham, Dr., 18, 23, 24
Latitudinarianism, 243
Law, William, 3, 258, 391
Lea, H. C., on celibacy, 121; on persecution, 161, 372, 374, 383
Le Blant, M., 40
Lecky, W. E. H., 63, 154-156, 230, 241-248, 372, 378, 383-384, 386
Leclercq, Dom H., 122, 137, 151
Leo the Great, 177, 180, 181, 374
Leo the Isaurian, 203
Lewis IV. of Bavaria, 189, 190, 387
Libanius, 105, 117
Liberius (Pope), 181
Liberty. *See* Toleration.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 40, 57, 365, 368
Lindsay, Dr. T. M., 212, 219, 361
Lithuania, conversion of, 130
Livonia, conversion of, 146
Livy, 42
Locke, John, 245-247
Lodge, Sir Oliver, 280
London, religion and public worship in, 275-276
Lothair, 184
Louis, St., 206, 381
Louis XIV., 240
Lucretius, 156
Luke, St., 8, 345
Lull, Raymond, 149-150
Luther, Martin, 219-226, 259, 338, 389
Lyall, Sir A., 301
Lyons, persecution at, 51, 55, 57

McCabe, J., 297
Maclear, Dr. G. F., 379
Magee, Archbishop, 294
Magic, Christians accused of, 48; legislation against, 115, 143-144, 154
Mahommedans, treatment of, by the Church, 149-151, 193-196, 387
Maitland, Professor F. W., 194, 208, 238, 388
Makower, F., 237
Malalas, Joannes, 113
Manichaeans, Western, 205
Marangoni, 375
Marriage, Christianity and, 52; marriage laws, 293-294; use of marriage service, 274
Marsilius of Padua, 150, 190, 192-194, 196, 387
Martin, St., 105, 137, 374, 376
Martin V., 207
Martyrdom, Martyrs, 52, 56-63, 259, 267, 361-363. *See also* Persecution.
Mary, Queen of England, 234
Mary, Queen of Scots, 237-238
Mason, Dr. A. J., 40, 51, 53, 60
Masterman, J. H. B., 336
Materialisation of Christian belief, 155
Maxentius, 90
Maximin, 59, 73
Mayor, Professor J. B., 350
Melanchthon, 223, 227, 392
Melito of Sardis, 64
"Membership without obligation," 273, 302, 309, 319-320, 323
Method, the Divine, 13-14; Christ's method, 17-18

Methodists, 296, 316
Metropolitan sees, 58, 171-172
Middleton, Conyers, 375
Milan, Edict of, 76, 93, 108, 160
Mill, J. S., 279
Milman, Dean, 144, 177, 180, 184, 187-189, 201-208
Milton, on toleration, 244
Ministry, the Christian, 72, 356
Minucius Felix, 53, 54, 367
Miracles, 21
Misanthropy imputed to Christians, 51, 54
Missionaries, mediaeval, 137 f., 148, 379; in America and India, 380-381
Missions, foreign, neglect of, 277; revival of, 320; wiser methods of modern missions, 320-321; boards of, 320; lessons to be derived from, 322-323
Mithraism, 78
Moberly, Dr. R. C., 276, 285, 331
Mommsen, Theodore, 32, 40, 42-43, 45, 47, 50-51, 57
Monasticism, 105, 120-121, 183, 188
Monolatry, 14
Monotheism, 14
Montanism, 58, 62, 68-69, 74, 79
Moore, Aubrey, 232
"Moral" theory of Gospels, 16
Morality, Christian, 79, 94, 118-120, 155-158
Morison, J. Cotter, 209
Morley, Lord, 212, 248, 386
Mormonism, 299
Mortmain, 207
Mount, Sermon on the, 16
Mouravieff, A. N., 142, 298
Mozley, Dr. J. B., 311
Mullinger, J. Bass, 375
Mundus, 353. *See* World.
Mylne, Bishop, 321, 381

"Name," persecution for the, 32, 48 f.
Napoleon, 218
National religion, in antiquity, 11-12, 32, 42, 138, 269-270
Nationalism, growth of, 224; religious nationalism developed by the Reformation, 224-226, 232, 237-239, 260, 270, 289; in the Eastern Church, 322
Natural religion, 13
Neander, A., 145-153 (notes)
Neo-Platonism, 77, 78
Nero, Neronian persecution, 31, 47-48, 49-50, 358-359
Neumann, K. J., 40, 47
Newman, Cardinal, 13, 81, 176-177, 368
New Testament books, criticism of, 7-10, 345-347; evidence of, as to the Church, 15-34
Nicaea, Council of, 38
Nicolas I., 181, 183, 203
Nicolas III., 198
Nietzsche, 279
Nominal Christianity, 4, 67, 100, 111 f., 149, 155, 164, 209, 272-283, 319 f., 333, 374
Nonconformity, 246, 254, 288-289, 295-296
Novatianism, 74, 98, 122

Odoacer, 135, 185-186
Olaf the Saint, 144, 147-148
Olaf Tryggvason, 144, 147-148
Old Testament, influence of ideas and precedents, 156, 162, 195, 211, 223, 235, 244, 249-250, 377, 383-384, 392-394; method of revelation in, 13, 14
Olympic Games, prohibited, 106
Optatus, 122
Ordination candidates, dearth of, 280-282
Organisation of the Church, 58, 171-172
Oriental religions, 12, 42, 78, 269
Origen, 61, 62, 367
Orthodoxy as test of Christianity, 156; as condition of citizenship, 197
Otto the Great, 188; Otto III., 188-189
Oxyrhyncus papyri, 59

Paganism; derivation of *paganus*, 107, 371-372; nature of pagan religion,

11, 12; antagonism between it and Christianity, 33, 51 f.; treatment of, by Constantine and his successors, 94-97; reaction under Julian, 97-100; suppression of, by later emperors, 101-106; it produces few martyrs, 63, 107; lingering remains of, 107; survivals of it in Christianity, 115-116, 154, 375-376; effect upon Christianity of absorption of paganism, 155-156
Palaeologus, Michael, 204; John, 204
Pan-Anglican Congress (1908), 315
Papacy. *See* Rome.
Parables: the Draw Net, 395; the Great Supper, 138; the Tares, 282, 395-397
Parliament, the Church in relation to, 236, 291-292
Parousia, belief in immediate, 9. 29, 65-66, 364-365
Pascal, 14
Pastor, Dr. L. von, 201
Pastoureaux, 205
Patriarchates, 172, 177
Patrick, St., 137, 144
Pattison, Mark, 248, 256
Paul, St., authenticity of Pauline epistles, 8, 345-346; teaching about sin, 9; attitude to Roman Empire, 64-65; his belief in the universal mission of the Church, 27; his conception of the universal ἐκκλησία, 27-30, 356-357; belief in the *Parousia*, 364-365
Paul of Samosata, 71-72
Paulinus of Nola, 116-117, 120
Paulinus of York, 142-143
Peile, J. H. F., 4, 124
Pelagianism, 174
Penitentials, 143, 157
Persecution, Christ's warning about, 21; originated by Jews, 31; survey of the persecutions enforced by Roman Empire, 31-63; causes of, 31, 51-56; extent of, 362-364; no special laws required, 50; action of magistrates, 51; of mob, 51; persecution sometimes successful, 63; bracing effects of, 67, 100; patristic views on, 372-374; St. Augustine, views on, 377-378; influence of Old Testament, 383-384; in Reformation period, 239 f.; Catholic and Protestant theories of, 241-243, 391-392; Bishop Creighton's theory of, 161-164, 378, 384
Pessimism, repudiation of, 267, 332
Peter, St., the promise to, 17; rebuke of, 169; Petrine claims, 181-183; epistles of, 8, 32, 48-49, 346
Peter the Great, 298; Peter Martyr, 231; Peter of Cluny, 382
Pharisaism, 324, 332
Philip the Fair, 206
Philostorgius, 136
Photius, 183, 203
Pleasant Sunday Afternoons, 325
Pliny, letter to Trajan, 49, 52, 56
Plummer, Dr. A., 17, 170, 396
Plummer, C., 143, 150, 153
Pollard, Professor A. F., 225
Polycarp, St., 51
Polytheism, 12, 42-43
Pontifex Maximus, title of, 93, 102, 212
Poole, Dr. R. L., 192-194, 211, 387
Popes. *See* Rome.
Porphyry of Gaza, 105
Prayer-Book, revision of, 291
Presbyterianism, 197, 237, 253
Prescott, W. H., 380, 381
Priscillian, Priscillianism, 122, 151, 174, 374
Privy Council, as Final Court of Appeal, 293
Procopius, 166
Protestantism, its strength, 259; its limitations, 260, 301; Protestant theory of persecution, 241-243, 391-392
Prudentius, 84
Prussia, conversion of, 131, 146-147
Public Worship Regulation Act, 292
Puller, F. W., 178, 181
Puritanism in Early Church, 68-69, 122; mediaeval, 205; at Reformation, 210, 223, 354; modern, 282

Quakers. *See* Friends, Society of.

Rackham, R. B., 355
Ramsay, Sir W. M., 8, 32, 40, 47, 48, 52, 347, 351, 359
Rationalism, 243-244
Reformation, abuses leading to, 197-208; precursors of, 205, 220; largely a revolt against practical evils, 219-221; survey of Continental Reformation, 221-231; of Reformation in England, 231-237; in Scotland, 237-239; its connection with nationalism, 239-240; with persecution, 240-243; with Erastianism, 249-253, 260
Remigius, 139-140
Renaissance, 220
Renan, Ernest, 21, 384
Rendall, Dr. G. H., 98
Retwald (or Redwald), 143
Reunion, the need and the difficulties of, 312-319
Revelation, Book of. *See* Apocalypse.
Revelation, method of, 14-15
Revolution, French, 247-248, 385
Rex v. *Dibdin*, 293
Ritschl, A., 19
Ritualism, 292
Robertson, Dr. (Bishop of Exeter), 11, 18, 69, 200, 220, 255-256, 390, 395
Robinson, J. Armitage (Dean of Westminster), 16, 29, 30, 72, 315
Roman Law, influence of Christianity on, 124, 197
Roman Catholics. *See* Rome.
Roman Empire. *See* Empire.
Rome, sack of, 131
Rome, Bishop, See, and Church of: primacy of honour, 71-72, 178; causes contributing to growth of papal power, 177-184; papal claims in full development, 190-192; corruption of Papacy, 198-206; Dante's condemnation of, 198-199; the system not reconcilable with the New Testament, 210-211; rejection of papal authority in England, 234-236; condition of Church of Rome at present time, 296-297; question of reunion with Rome, 317
Romulus Augustulus, 186
Rousseau, 21
Royal supremacy, in England, 233-237; in Scotland, 238
Ruinart, 40
Russia, conversion of, 140-141; Church of, 297-298

Sabatier, Paul, 297, 328
Sacerdotalism, 333-335
Sacerdotium, 196
Sacraments, 18, 24, 54
Sacrifice, a necessary element in Christianity, 15, 20 f.
Saints (ἅγιοι), 28, 354; relics and superstitious worship of, 116-117; invocation of, 220
Salmon, Dr., 176-178, 181-183
Salvian, 119
Sanday, Dr., 351, 358
Sardican canons, 182
Sardinia, paganism in, 114
Savonarola, 220
Saxons, conversion of, 144-146, 153
Scandinavia, conversion of, 144, 147-148; religion in, 260
Schism, 74; of East and West, 203. *See also* Heresy.
Schmiedel, Dr., 10
Schürer, Dr. E., 11, 44
Schweitzer, A., 350-351
Scotland, Reformation in, 237-239; Established Church of, 239, 316; United Free Church Judgment, 288; reunion, 316
Scott, C. Anderson, 136
Sectarianism, 260
Secularisation, of Church, 79, 110-125, 197 f., 212-213, 258; of politics, literature, and thought, 272
Seculum, 353
Selborne, Lord, 289
Selden, 394
Septimius Severus, 59
Sergius III., 188
Servetus, burning of, 227-230, 241
Servus Servorum Dei, 210
Sicily, 114, 117, 376

Slavery, Christianity and, 52
Smyth, Dr. Newman, 278, 301, 318
Social intercourse, Christians and, 53-54
Societas perfecta, 255-256, 337
Socinus, 240-242
Socrates (historian), 100-102, 112, 136
Sohm, R., 159, 171-173
Soldiers, Christianity and the profession of, 53-54
Soyres, J. de, 69, 74
Sozomen, 100-101, 136
Spain, Christianity in, 79; persecution of Jews, 150, 382; of Moors, 381; survivals of paganism, 376
Spartianus, 59
Spinoza, 251
Spirit, the Holy, in the Church, 24, 261, 308
Stanley, Dean, 86-87, 142, 176
State, in relation to Church—in Judaism, 11; in Greco-Roman paganism, 12; in early Christianity, 31-32, 39-64; from Constantine to Justinian, 92-110; under Charles the Great, 188; mediaeval theories, 196-197; effects of Reformation, 223-231, 248-258; in England, 233-237, 288-295, 326-331; in Scotland, 237-238; on Continent, 239-240; in Eastern Church, 297-298; in New World, 298; "Free Church in Free State," 336-337. *See also* Establishment, Erastianism, World.
Sternness of Christ, 21, 169
Stone, Dr. Darwell, 390
Stubbs, Bishop, 157, 202, 232
Student Christian Movement, 316
Sturm, Abbot of Fulda, 153
Sun and Moon, Pope and Emperor compared to, 192, 194-195
Sunday, 94, 104
Superstition, 116-118, 155-156, 375-376
Swete, Dr., 358, 360
Switzerland, Reformation in, 220
Swords, the Two, 189, 192, 194-195
Sylvester II., 189
Symmachus, 103, 105
Synagogue, influence of, on Christian Church, 26
Syncretism, 47, 369
Synesius, 121

Tacitus, 31, 54
Tait, Archbishop, 292
Talbot, Dr. (Bishop of Southwark), 283-384, 311
Tares, parable of the, 282, 395-397
Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 245, 372
Temple, Archbishop, 25
Tertullian, 31, 36, 41, 45, 49, 50, 52-57, 59, 62, 66, 68-69, 85, 363, 372, 373
Teutonic Knights, 144, 146-147
Thekla, *Acts* of Paul and, 52
Themistius, 102, 105
Theocracy, Jewish, 11; attempt of the Papacy to establish a, 162; theocracy of Calvin and Zwingli, 228; failure of such attempts, 212, 337
Theodora, 106-107
Theodoret, 112, 117-118, 136, 375
Theodoric, 135-136, 149
Theodosianus, Codex, 74, 95, 97, 104-106, 382
Theodosius I., religious policy of, 103-105, 185, 197, 374
Theodosius II., 105, 113, 382
Theophilus of Antioch, 105, 112
Tithes, 145, 188, 220
Tolbiac, battle of, 139
Toleration: general policy of Roman Empire, 42-43; why Christianity was excepted, 47 f.; toleration proclaimed by Edict of Milan, 93; patristic opinions for and against, 109-110, 372-374; abandoned by Constantine's successors, 97-110; by St. Augustine, 374, 377; rejected by leading reformers, 222 f., 240 f.; slow growth of principle, 243-247; Toleration Act, 247; practical completion of toleration in England, 247; Bishop Creighton's theory of, 161, 244, 384
Trade, interference of Christianity with, 32, 52
Trajan, 49, 57

Translatio Imperii, 191-192
Trench, Archbishop, 396-397
Tribal conversion, 144, 153, 155
Tudors, the, and the Reformation, 232; ecclesiastical despotism of, 234-236
Turkish rule, Christians under, 297-298
Tusculan popes, 200
Tyrrell, Father George, 351

Uganda, 322
Ulfilas, 135-136
Ultramontanism, 208
Undenominationalism, 16, 271, 284-285, 331
Uniformity in religion, the ideal of the Reformation, 300; not necessary to unity, 313-314
Unitarians, 246
United States, diversity of religions in, 270, 299
Unity in diversity, 313
"Universal Bishop," title repudiated by Gregory the Great, 182-183
Universal *Ecclesia*, the, 29, 355-357
Universal Mission of the Church, 10, 27, 348-350

Valens, 101-102, 314
Valentinian, 101-102
Valerian, persecution of, 59
Vandals, 122, 136-137
Vernon, Hon. W. W., 198
Vespasian, 48
Victor (Pope), 178
Victory, removal of statue of, 102-103
Vienne, persecution at, 51, 55
Vigilantius, 117
Vigilius (Pope), 181
Virgin, worship of the Blessed, 118
Visible Church, 15, 18, 19, 389-390
Visitatorial power of kings of England, 235
Vladimir of Russia, conversion of, 141
Voltaire, 217, 247-248, 385

Wakeman, H. O., 235-237, 258
Waldenses, 205
Walpole, Dr. G. H. S., 18
Walpole, Sir Robert, 257
Warburton, Bishop, 256
Wesley, John, 258
Westcott, Bishop, 81, 92, 124, 353-354, 359-361, 362
Whitgift, Archbishop, 253
"Wholesale" methods of conversion, 138 f., 145, 150, 153, 155, 301, 378-380
Wilfrid, 142-143
William of Ockham, 190, 194, 387
Witness, a primary duty of the Church, 265-267; the Church's power of witness crippled, 268
Wolfgang Musculus, 394
Wordsworth, Bishop John, 88
Wordsworth, William, 162, 216
Workman, H. B., 40, 52, 53, 60, 81
World, distinct from the Church in Christ's teaching, 20-23; antagonism in the Apocalypse, 35-36; in Ante-Nicene Church, 65 f., 81-82; fusion of World and Church after Constantine, 111 f.; in conversion of barbarians, 152 f.; in mediaeval theory, 196, 208 f.; absence of clear distinction at present time, 261, 279, 284; need of reviving the distinction, 302, 307, 340
Worms, Concordat of, 188
Worship, decline of attendance at public, 275-276

Xavier, François, 321, 380-381
Ximenes, Cardinal, 381, 392

Zacharias (Pope), 145
Zahn, Dr. Theodore, 371
Zebedee, sons of, 170
Zeno (Emperor), 174
Zosimus (historian), 86, 103
Zosimus (Pope), 174, 181
Zürich. *See* Zwingli.
Zwingli, 219, 227-228, 240, 390

Printed by R. & R. Clark, Limited, *Edinburgh*.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 849 501 2